DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 966

AC 002 729

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the National University Extension Association (52nd, University of Michigan, April 23-25, 1967). Volume 50.

National Univ. Extension Association, Minneapolis, Minn.

Pub Date 67

Note- 151p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$7.65

Descriptors- *Annual Reports, Community Development, Foundation Programs, *Professional Associations, Residential Programs, Role Perception, Social Change, *University Extension

Identifiers- Kellogg Foundation

Listed are the names of member institutions of the National University Extension Association, directors, committees, delegates, special appointees (1966-1967), board of directors (1967-1968), and committees and sections (1967-68). Included also are the reports of divisions and committees. In one address, the work of the Kellogg Foundation is described--its support of continuing education, establishment of nine residential centers, and its preparation of guidelines for people who want to establish residential centers. Another address focuses on community development with emphasis on Title 1 of the Higher Education Act. This act authorizes appropriations "For the purpose of assisting the people of the United States in the solution of community problems." Special attention goes to sections 101 and 105. Other addresses examine learning in short residential conferences; the new mixture of students, schools, services, and society; fulfillment of societal needs through short term learning; and continuing education as part of the mainstream of American education. (nl)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Proceedings

of the

FIFTY-SECOND ANNUAL MEETING

of the

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY EXTENSION ASSOCIATION

at

Ann Arbor, Michigan

April 23-25, 1967

***Host:* The University of Michigan**

Volume 50

AC 002 729

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

The National University Extension Association

Member Institutions 4

Directors, Committees, Delegates, and Special Appointees, 1966-67 .. 6

Board of Directors, 1967-68 8

Committee and Section Chairmen, 1967-68 9

Program, 52nd Annual Meeting 12

Pre-Conference Sessions, April 21-22

"Learning in the Short Residential Conference" by Royce Pitkin 17

"The Changing Role of the University in Society" by Lynn W. Eley.. 22

"Sociological Backgrounds and Rationale for Learning in Short-Term Settings" by Wilbur Brookover 31

"How Does Short-Term Learning Fulfill Societal Needs" by Robert Blakely 38

"Instructional Media—Old, New, and Otherwise" by Ohmer Milton... 46

Opening General Session, Sunday, April 23 54
"One Foundation's Concept of Continuing Education"
By Robert E. Kinsinger

Second General Session, Sunday, April 23 61
"Continuing Education in the Mainstream of the University":
Presentations by Harold E. Sponberg and R. L. Smith

Presentations to the Community Development Division, Monday, April 24
"Evaluation of Title One of the Higher Education Act of 1965"
By D. Mack Easton 69

"Students, Schools, Service, and Society — A New Mix"
By Joseph G. Colmen 76

Presentation to the Division of Evening Colleges and Class Extension, Monday, April 24 82
"Adventure and the Emerging Roles of the Adult Education Leader"
By Howard McClusky

Third General Session, Monday, April 24 89
The Report of the President
By Charles Milner

Fourth General Session, Tuesday, April 25

"Call to Cooperation"
By Alan MacCarthy 95

"Continuing Education — Our Mutual Concern"
By Jack Miller 99

Inaugural Address
By T. Howard Walker 104

Business Meeting, Tuesday, April 25 108

NUEA Resolutions, 1967 111

Minutes of the Board of Directors Meetings 115

Reports of the Divisions

Division of Audio-Visual Communications 126
Division of Community Development 126
Division of Conferences and Institutes 128
Division of Correspondence Study 129
Division of Evening Colleges and Class Extension 131

Reports of the Committees and Sections

Section on Administrative and Fiscal Affairs 133
Section for the Administrators of Centers of Continuing Education.. 134
Section on Arts and Humanities 135
Awards and Honors Committee 136
Committee on Discussion and Debate 138
Section on Extension Services for the Armed Forces 139
Financial Affairs Committee 139
Governmental Relations Committee 140
Inter-Associational Relations Committee 140
Joint AUEC-NUEA Committee on Minimum Data and Definitions.. 140
Ad Hoc Committee on Organization Structure and Fee Modification.. 141
Section on Professional Development of University Adult Education.. 142
Committee on Publications and Public Information 144
Research Section 144
Section on Teacher Education 145
World Affairs Section 146
Financial Report 147

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY EXTENSION ASSOCIATION

Member Institutions 1966-67

1. University of Alabama
2. University of Alaska
3. University of Alberta
4. University of Arizona
5. University of Arkansas
6. Ball State University
7. Boston University
8. Bowling Green State University
9. Bradley University
10. Brigham Young University
11. University of British Columbia
12. University of California
13. Carson-Newman College
14. Central Michigan University
15. Central Washington State College
16. The University of Chicago
17. University of Cincinnati
18. University of Colorado
19. University of Connecticut
20. Cornell University
21. University of Delaware
22. East Carolina College
23. Eastern Michigan University
24. Eastern New Mexico University
25. State University System of Florida
26. University of Florida
27. Fort Hays Kansas State College
28. The George Washington University
29. The University of Georgia
30. Georgia Institute of Technology
31. Harvard University
32. University of Hawaii
33. Home Study Institute, Washington, D.C.
34. University of Idaho
35. University of Illinois
36. Indiana State University
37. Indiana University
38. Iowa State University
39. State College of Iowa
40. The University of Iowa
41. The Johns Hopkins University
42. Kansas State College of Pittsburg
43. Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia
44. Kansas State University
45. University of Kansas
46. Kent State University
47. University of Kentucky
48. Louisiana State University
49. Loyola University
50. University of Maine
51. The University of Manitoba
52. University of Maryland
53. Massachusetts Department of Education
54. Miami University, Oxford, Ohio
55. Michigan State University
56. Michigan Technological University
57. University of Michigan
58. University of Minnesota
59. Mississippi State University
60. University of Mississippi
61. University of Missouri
62. Montana State University
63. University of Montreal
64. University of Nebraska
65. University of Nevada
66. University of New Hampshire
67. The University of New Mexico
68. State University of New York at Buffalo
69. New York University
70. North Carolina State University at Raleigh
71. University of North Carolina
72. North Dakota State University
73. State of North Dakota, Fargo

74. University of North Dakota
75. Northeastern University
76. Northern Illinois University
77. Northern Michigan University
78. Northwestern University
79. University of Notre Dame
80. Oakland University
81. The Ohio State University
82. Ohio University
83. Oklahoma State University
84. University of Oklahoma
85. University of Omaha
86. Oregon State System of Higher Education
87. The Pennsylvania State University
88. University of Pittsburgh
89. University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez
90. University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras
91. Purdue University
92. University of Rhode Island
93. Rochester Institute of Technology
94. Rutgers—The State University
95. St. Louis University
96. University of South Carolina
97. South Dakota State University
98. University of South Dakota
99. University of Southern California
100. Southern Illinois University
101. Southern Methodist University
102. University of Southern Mississippi
103. Syracuse University
104. The University of Tennessee
105. Texas Technological College
106. The University of Texas
107. Upper Iowa University
108. Utah State University
109. University of Utah
110. Virginia State College
111. University of Virginia
112. Washington State University
113. University of Washington
114. Washington University of St. Louis
115. Wayne State University
116. West Virginia University
117. Western Illinois University
118. Western Michigan University
119. Western Reserve University
120. Western Washington State College
121. University of Wisconsin
122. University of Wyoming

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY EXTENSION ASSOCIATION

Directors, Committees, Delegates, and Special Appointees
1966-67

Board of Directors

Executive Committee

CHARLES F. MILNER, University of North Carolina, *President*

T. HOWARD WALKER, University of Kansas, *Vice President and President-Elect*

STANLEY J. DRAZEK, University of Maryland, *Secretary-Treasurer*

ALEXANDER N. CHARTERS, Syracuse University, *Immediate Past-President*

Directors-at-large

DONALD M. SEARCY, University of Southern California, 1964-1967

RUSSELL F. W. SMITH, New York University, 1964-1967

C. H. LAWSHE, Purdue University, 1965-1968

STANLEY C. ROBINSON, University of Illinois, 1965-1968

CLAUD A. BOSWORTH, Northern Michigan University, 1966-1969

ROBERT F. RAY, University of Iowa, 1966-1969

Divisional Directors

FRITZ A. WHITE, The University of Wisconsin
Division of Audio-Visual Communications

ROBERT CHILD, Southern Illinois University
Division of Community Development

EDMUND JENUSAITIS, Rutgers—The State University
Division of Conferences and Institutes

ELIZABETH POWELL, University of Georgia
Division of Correspondence Study

DONALD Z. WOODS, University of Minnesota
Division of Evening Colleges and Class Extension

Executive Director

ROBERT J. PITCHELL, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C.

Advisory Council ***(All Active Past-Presidents)***

ALEXANDER N. CHARTERS, Chairman

L. H. ADOLFSON
K. O. BROADY
J. W. BROUILLETTE
STANLEY J. DRAZEK
D. MACK EASTON
J. R. D. EDDY
E. L. KELLER
ERNEST MCMAHON
JOHN R. MORTON
H. R. NEVILLE
PAUL H. SHEATS
E. J. SOOP

Administrative Committees

American Indian Affairs Committee
HAROLD O. RIED, University of New Mexico

Awards and Honors Committee
HAROLD GLENN CLARK, Brigham Young University

Discussion and Debate Committee
D. MACK EASTON, University of Colorado

Financial Affairs Committee
C. H. LAWSHE, Purdue University

Governmental Relations Committee
HOWARD WALKER, University of Kansas

Inter-Associational Relations Committee
C. BRICE RATCHFORD, University of Missouri

Nominations Committee
JAMES R. D. EDDY, University of Texas

Program Committee for Annual Conference
HOWARD WALKER, University of Kansas

Regional Meetings Committee
JAMES SHERBURNE, Oregon State System of Higher Education

Resolutions Committee
BEN GUSTAFSON, University of North Dakota

Time and Site Committee
RUSSELL F. W. SMITH, New York University

Vestibule Committee
JAMES R. D. EDDY, University of Texas

Publications and Public Affairs Committee
NICHOLAS P. MITCHELL, University of South Carolina

Administrative Committee — Liaison

Minimum Data and Definitions
PHILLIP E. FRANDSON, University of California

Sections

Administrative and Fiscal Affairs Section
JOHN A. WILKINS, University of Michigan

Arts and Humanities Section
RICHARD SIMONS, George Washington University

Extension Service for Armed Forces Section
O. W. SNARR, Bradley University

Professional Development of University Adult Education Section
HAROLD MONTROSS, University of Wisconsin

Residential Center Manager Section
RICHARD H. STOTTLER, University of Maryland

Research Section
JOHN L. DAVIES, University of Iowa

Special Programs Development Section
HAROLD KENTNER, Rochester Institute of Technology

Teacher Education Section
GORDON GODBEY, Pennsylvania State University

World Affairs Section
LEONARD FREEDMAN, University of California

Special Assignments

Office of Civil Defense
HOWARD WALKER, University of Kansas

UNESCO Affairs
WILLIAM C. ROGERS, *University of Minnesota*

Temporary and Ad Hoc Committees

Kellogg Proposal Committee
RUSSELL F. W. SMITH, New York University

Organization Structure and Fee Modification Committee
STANLEY C. ROBINSON, University of Illinois

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE ASSOCIATION 1967-68

Executive Committee

T. HOWARD WALKER, University of Kansas, *President*

STANLEY C. ROBINSON, University of Illinois, *Vice President* and *President-Elect*

FLOYD B. FISCHER, The Pennsylvania State University, *Secretary*

ROBERT F. RAY, University of Iowa, *Treasurer*

CHARLES F. MILNER, University of North Carolina, *Immediate Past President*

ROBERT J. PITCHELL, Washington, D.C., *Executive Director*

Directors-at-large

C. H. LAWSHE, Purdue University, 1965-68

FRANK R. NEUFFER, University of Cincinnati, 1967-68

CLAUD A. BOSWORTH, Northern Michigan University, 1966-69

JAMES W. SHERBURNE, Oregon State System of Higher Education, 1967-70

SMITH HIGGINS, Indiana University, 1967-70

Divisional Directors

GENE FARIS, Indiana University
Division of Audio-Visual Communications

OTTO G. HOIBERG, University of Nebraska
Division of Community Development

ALFRED STOREY, University of Michigan
Division of Conferences and Institutes

DENVER SLOAN, University of Kentucky
Division of Correspondence Study

LOWELL EKLUND, Oakland University
Division of Evening Colleges and Class Extension

COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN
1967-68

Administrative Committees

Awards and Honors Committee
EVERETT SOOP, University of Michigan

Discussion and Debate Committee
NORRIS HIETT, University of Texas

Financial Affairs Committee
C. H. LAWSHE, Purdue University

Governmental Relations Committee
CHARLES F. MILNER, University of North Carolina

Inter-Associational Relations Committee
C. BRICE RATCHFORD, University of Missouri

Nominations Committee
JAMES R. D. EDDY, Honorary Member

Program Committee for Annual Conference
STANLEY C. ROBINSON, University of Illinois

Regional Meetings Committee
HAROLD GLENN CLARK, Brigham Young University

Resolutions Committee
RUSSELL F. W. SMITH, New York University

Time and Site Committee
J. C. EVANS, Oklahoma State University

Vestibule Committee
STANLEY J. DRAZEK, University of Maryland

Publications and Public Information Committee
WILLARD L. THOMPSON, University of Minnesota

American Indian Affairs Committee
LEE HAYDEN, University of Oklahoma

Charter, Bylaws and Fees Committee
ARMAND HUNTER, Michigan State University

Organizational Structure Committee
ARMAND HUNTER, Michigan State University

Administrative Committees—Liaison

AUEC-NUEA Joint Committee on Minimum Data and Definitions
PHILLIP E. FRANDSON, University of California

Committee on Adult Education Organizations (CAEO)
T. HOWARD WALKER, University of Kansas, and ROBERT J. PITCHELL, Washington, D.C., NUEA Representatives

GFWC-NUEA Liaison Committee (General Federation of Women's Clubs)
DUANE GIBSON, Washington State University

AAC-NUEA Liaison Committee (American Alumni Council)
LOWELL EKLUND, Oakland University

NAPSAE-NUEA Liaison Committee (National Association of Public School Adult Educators—ABE Contract)
T. HOWARD WALKER, University of Kansas

Sections

Administrative and Fiscal Affairs Section
WARREN SCHOONOVER, University of California at Los Angeles

Arts and Humanities Section
ROBERT ERICKSON, Oakland University

Extension Service for Armed Forces Section
EUGENE MAGRUDER, George Washington University

Education Professional Development Section
WILLIAM DOWLING, Ohio State University, and GORDON GODBEY, The Pennsylvania State University, co-chairmen

Residential Center Managers Section
RICHARD H. STOTTLER, University of Maryland

Research Section
WILLIAM S. GRIFFITH, University of Chicago

Special Programs Development Section
J. L. TRAVER, University of Utah

World Affairs Section
WILLIAM C. ROGERS, University of Minnesota

Continuing Education Programs for Business, Industry and Labor
WILLIAM TURNER, North Carolina State University at Raleigh

Temporary and Ad Hoc Committees

Kellogg Proposal
RUSSELL F. W. SMITH, New York University

Committee for the Study of the 1961 Position Paper and Future Directions of the Association
ROBERT F. RAY, University of Iowa

Guide Study Committee
CHARLES F. MILNER, University of North Carolina

Committee on Establishment of Sections for Continuing Education of the Professions
LYNN ELEY, Washington University of St. Louis

Program

52nd Annual Meeting
National University Extension Association

April 23-25, 1967

Host Institution: The University of Michigan
in cooperation with Michigan NUEA Universities:
Central Michigan University, Eastern Michigan University,
Michigan Technological University, Michigan State University,
Northern Michigan University, Oakland University, Wayne State
University, and Western Michigan University

THEME: *Knowledge, Wisdom, and the Courage to Serve—*
Continuing Education

SUNDAY, APRIL 23

8:00 a.m.—REGISTRATION
8:00 p.m.

9:30 a.m. NUEA DEANS AND DIRECTORS ROUND TABLE
(Continuation from Saturday, April 22)
Presiding: Howard Walker, University of Kansas

1:30 p.m. VESTIBULE SESSION
Presiding: James R. D. Eddy, University of Texas

3:00 p.m. OPENING GENERAL SESSION
Presiding: Charles F. Milner, University of North Carolina
Greetings: Harlan H. Hatcher, president, The University of Michigan
Speaker: Robert E. Kinsinger, W. K. Kellogg Foundation

5:00 p.m. RECEPTION
(Reception honoring officers of A.F.S.T.E. and NUEA)

6:00 p.m. BUFFET DINNER

7:30 p.m. GENERAL SESSION II
Presiding: Everett J. Soop, University of Michigan
Topic: Continuing Education in the Mainstream of the University
Symposium—Panel: Harold E. Sponberg, president, Eastern Michigan University, moderator; William R. Keast, president, Wayne State University; Raymond L. Smith, president, Michigan Technological University; and Durward B. Varner, chancellor, Oakland University.

9:15 p.m. **CONFERENCES AND INSTITUTES DIVISIONAL MEETING**

Presiding: Alfred W. Storey, The University of Michigan.

Topics and Speakers: "Research—Implications for C. and I.", Malcolm Van Duersen; "Dissemination of Information—the C. and I, Way," Paul McWilliams; "Professional Development, Quality, and Ethics," Tunis Dekker; "C. and I. Recognition Awards," John Fraser; and "Your Business and Ours," Alfred W. Storey.

MONDAY, APRIL 24

7:30 a.m. **BOARD OF DIRECTORS BREAKFAST**

9:00 a.m. **DIVISION MEETINGS**

DIVISION OF AUDIO-VISUAL COMMUNICATIONS

Presiding: *Fritz A. White*, University of Wisconsin

DIVISION OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Theme: Federal Programs Affecting Community Development.

Chairman: *Otto Hoiberg*, University of Nebraska.

Topics and Speakers: "Duties and Acts of the National Council for Continuing Education and Extension Programs," Joseph G. Colmen, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare; "Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965—Present and Future," Paul Delker, U.S. Office of Education; and "Evaluation of Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965," D. Mack Easton, University of Colorado.

DIVISION OF CONFERENCES AND INSTITUTES

Topic: Problems and Issues Facing C. and I. Personnel: (a) The Newcomer to C. and I. (b) Conference Coordinators and (c) Conference Directors.

DIVISION OF CORRESPONDENCE STUDY

Presiding: *Elizabeth Powell*, University of Georgia

Discussion: Special Services to Correspondence Study.

DIVISION OF EVENING COLLEGES AND CLASS EXTENSION

Address: Adventure and the Emerging Roles of the Adult Education Leader.

Speaker: *Howard McClusky*, The University of Michigan.

Reactor Panel: *Thurman White*, University of Oklahoma; *Clifford L. Winters*, Syracuse University, and *Smith Higgins*, Indiana University.

Division Business Meeting.

12:15 p.m. **GENERAL SESSION III**

Annual NUEA Luncheon, Honors and Election.

Presiding: *Charles F. Milner*, University of North Carolina

2:15 p.m. **SECTION MEETINGS**

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FISCAL AFFAIRS

Presiding: *John A. Wilkins*, The University of Michigan

Topic: Program Budgeting Consideration for Extension.

ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Award Selections

Presiding: *Robert M. Erickson*, Oakland University

EXTENSION SERVICES FOR THE ARMED FORCES

Presiding: *O. W. Snarr*, Bradley University

Topic: Packaged Contracts

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Presiding: *Harold Montross*, University of Wisconsin

RESEARCH

Presiding: *John L. Davies*, University of Iowa

RESIDENTIAL CENTER MANAGERS

Presiding: *Richard H. Stottler*, University of Maryland

Topics and Speakers: "Why Organize a Section for Center Administrators?" *Robert F. Ernstein*, University of Maryland; and "Let's Get Acquainted with Center Operations," *W. R. Alexander*, University of Georgia.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS DEVELOPMENT

Presiding: *Harold M. Kentner*, Rochester Institute of Technology

TEACHER EDUCATION

Presiding: *Gordon C. Godbey*, The Pennsylvania State University.

WORLD AFFAIRS

Presiding: *Leonard Freedman*, University of California

8:00 p.m. **COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Presiding: *Howard Walker*, University of Kansas

INTER-ASSOCIATIONAL RELATIONS

Presiding: *C. Brice Ratchford*, University of Missouri

TUESDAY, APRIL 25

7:30 a.m. **BREAKFAST MEETING**

(For old and new members of the Board of Directors)

9:00 a.m. **DIVISION MEETINGS**

DIVISION OF AUDIO-VISUAL COMMUNICATIONS

DIVISION OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Presiding: *Robert Child*, Southern Illinois University

Business Meeting

DIVISION OF CONFERENCES AND INSTITUTES

Presiding: *Larry O. Nelson*, Purdue University

Evaluation and Projection

DIVISION OF CORRESPONDENCE STUDY

Presiding: *Elizabeth Powell*, University of Georgia

Division Business

DIVISION OF EVENING COLLEGES AND CLASS EXTENSION

Chairman: *Donald Z. Woods*, University of Minnesota

Theme: Significant Programs—with Convertible Features

Topics and Speakers: "The Volunteer Urban-Agent Program," *John E. Bebout*, Rutgers—The State University; "The Weekend University," *J. E. Burkett*, University of Oklahoma; "The Impact of the Mexican-American on Society," *George H. Daigneault*, University of California; and "Mid-Career Guidance for Adults," *Nancy K. Schlossberg*, Wayne State University.

10:45 a.m. SECTION MEETINGS

ADMINISTRATIVE AND FISCAL AFFAIRS

Presiding: *John A. Wilkins*, University of Michigan

ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Presiding: *Robert M. Erickson*, Oakland University

EXTENSION SERVICES FOR THE ARMED FORCES

Presiding: *William Utley*, University of Omaha

Topic: Special Degrees

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Presiding: *Harold Montross*, University of Wisconsin

RESEARCH

Presiding: *John L. Davies*, University of Iowa

Planning Session

RESIDENTIAL CENTER MANAGERS

Panel: Administrative Problems of Operating a Center

Moderator: *Robert Emerson*, Michigan State University; Panelists: *W. R. Alexander*, University of Georgia; *James S. Beadle*, University of Notre Dame; *Floyd Fischer*, The Pennsylvania State University; *Allen F. Krause*, University of Nebraska; *Lee L. Smith*, Syracuse University; and *R. H. Stottler*, University of Maryland.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS DEVELOPMENT
Presiding: *Harold M. Kentner,* Rochester Institute of Technology

TEACHER EDUCATION
Presiding: *Gordon C. Godbey,* The Pennsylvania State University

12:15 p.m. **GENERAL SESSION IV**

NUEA Luncheon
Presiding: Howard Walker, University of Kansas

Topic: Call to Cooperation
Speaker: Alan W. MacCarthy, past president, American Alumni Council

Topic: Continuing Education—Our Mutual Concern
Speaker: The Honorable Jack Miller, United States Senator from Iowa.

2:15 p.m. **ANNUAL BUSINESS SESSION**

4:00 p.m. **MEETING FOR NEW OFFICERS OF DIVISIONS, SECTIONS, AND COMMITTEES**

5:00 p.m. **CONFERENCE ADJOURNMENT**

PROCEEDINGS
of the
FIFTY-SECOND ANNUAL MEETING
of the
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY EXTENSION ASSOCIATION

Pre-Conference Sessions

PRESENTATION TO THE CONFERENCES AND INSTITUTES DIVISION

FRIDAY, APRIL 21

LEARNING IN THE SHORT RESIDENTIAL CONFERENCE

Royce S. Pitkin
President, Goddard College

It is my understanding that "short-term learning situation" refers to the kind of residential conference that involves sleeping and eating on the grounds upon which the learning is expected to occur. Such a residential conference might be as brief as 24 hours or it might run for two weeks. We may assume also that the short-term learning situation is concerned with a specific subject and has a fairly well defined purpose.

Of course the shorter the conference period, the greater the need for making every moment count. It is quite possible that the way in which registration of conferees is handled will have something to do with the amount of learning that takes place, because learning appears to be affected by the setting in which it occurs. If, for example, the registrant is made to feel that he is genuinely welcomed and not simply being given the glad hand, his identification with the conference group gets off to a good start. If the rooms to which the conferees are assigned are adjacent to one another, the opportunities for interaction are, of course, likely to be greater than if the rooms are widely separated. If the meals are served in a room in which conversation can be carried on easily, and if the atmosphere is leisurely and friendly, the exchange of ideas, information, and opinion is more likely to occur than if the group is widely dispersed, harried, and in a place in which sound reverberates extensively.

The major justification for the residential conference is that it can provide the conditions that are most conducive to learning. However, these conditions have to be created. They don't just happen. Whenever we engage in planning for a learning situation, it is useful to give some consideration to what we mean by learning and how it occurs. I like to think of learning as the modification of behavior that persists. If one learns something he behaves differently than he did before he learned. For example, if one learns to enjoy poetry one will turn to poetry for enjoyment. Or if one has really learned to spell correctly a particular word, such as *belief* or *receive*, one will put the *i* before the *e* and the *e* before the *i* whenever one writes a letter using those words.

Learning is at once a highly individualized process and a transactional process; that is, learning occurs when one contributes something to his environment—and that environment may include people, books, things, action—and when he takes something from the environment. It is individual because each person brings to the learning situation his own set of motivations and his own prior experiences and learnings. Inasmuch as all new learning is based on previous learnings, and the previous learnings of no two persons are the same, it follows that what one individual learns in a given situation is not necessarily what another individual learns. Moreover, as the motives of each individual tend to be somewhat different from his fellows, we can never be certain as to the kind of reaction that will follow from a given presentation or effort to induce the learning of a particular thing.

If we intend to make the most of the short residential conference, we have to decide what we think are the characteristics of a good learning situation. A good place to start is with the planners, for unless they are clear about the goals they have in mind for the conference, it will be difficult to design a program. Not only is it essential that there be clarity of goals on the part of the planners, there must also be an acceptance of those goals by the participants. It is not enough for the conference planners to say that the purpose of the conference is to learn how to eliminate the pollution of ponds and streams; it is also necessary that the conferees *want* to learn how to eliminate pollution. If the real goal of half of the participants is to find out who at the conference would be good customers for certain products and services, the extent to which the goals of the planners will be attained is likely to be somewhat limited. This suggests that allowance needs to be made for the expression of individual goals or purposes.

A third characteristic of a good learning situation is that the learners recognize that there is a problem to be solved or a need to be met which is of concern to them. There is little likelihood that much learning will occur unless each person really feels the need to learn.

A fourth characteristic of the good group learning situation is that those who belong to the group recognize one another as resources. Not only is the other person to be regarded as a source of information but also as a person with whom one can test his ideas and opinions. The good learning situation is one in which people feel comfortable, accepted by others, and supported by the friendliness of the climate. It is under such circumstances that a person is able to be more accurate in his perceptions and less likely to have a distorted view of what is going on.

Inasmuch as learning is an active process, one which involves the entire body, it is important that there be good opportunities to become involved with the group. For many persons this means the opportunity for talking. It seems to be important for most individuals to establish themselves with the other members of the group by saying something. Whenever one says something in a group situation, it increases his stake in the direction of affairs.

In the good learning situation there is freedom from unnecessary tensions and fatigue. One of the virtues of the residential conference is that it can, to a considerable degree, protect the conferees from the pressures and demands of their jobs and their domestic affairs. However, unless some attention is paid to providing for relaxation and recreation, this freedom from tension may be offset by undue fatigue. Closely associated with freedom from tensions and fatigue is emotional security and freedom from threat. That is to say, the atmosphere of the conference needs to be such that each conferee feels free to express himself without fear of ridicule or loss of status with the group.

A good learning situation requires free communication. When we recall that learning is a transactional process through which the learner receives information, reacts to the information, expresses ideas, raises questions, reconstructs familiar experiences in the light of the new information and new ideas, it is evident that we need to exploit all of the opportunities for communication that exist in the residential conference. It is through this freedom of expression that the directors of the conference get some notion of how effective their efforts are.

Learning in a conference situation appears to be facilitated if there is a real group spirit and if each individual feels that he is part of the group. The development of such a group spirit occurs when those who constitute the group have had enough common experiences to enable them to *feel* that they have interests, goals, and aspirations in common. Thus the good learning situation includes opportunities for a variety of common experiences. If everybody eats in the same dining room, the food service provides such a common experience and is often the vehicle by which some persons begin to communicate with others.

The final characteristic of the good short-term learning situation is the presence of a teacher, or what Peter Siegle has been calling "the resident tutor," or a conference coordinator. Such a person can be helpful by providing continuity in the program, by being available to the conferees for information, for a certain amount of companionship, for support, and by keeping before the group the goals of the conference.

The procedures that should be used in a given residential conference are likely to be greatly affected by the kinds of learning that are sought. Among these kinds of learning are the acquisition of information. In a conference for farmers the goal might be to learn what the latest price support program is. For certain implement dealers it might be learning the features of a new tractor or road machine. Another kind of learning is changing attitudes. A third is solving a problem. Another is developing a skill. A fifth is making decisions. A sixth kind of learning is that of working together. And a seventh, which contributes to achievement of the other types of learning, is learning to accept oneself; another way of putting it is learning to be autonomous, being able to function without undue dependence upon others.

In planning the program of a short residential conference, it is helpful to keep in mind the types of learning that are sought. Although the different kinds of learning are interrelated, the purposes of a particular conference are more likely to be achieved if attention is given to the kind of learning that is to be emphasized. The basic principles of learning apply to most situations, but since the goals of a residential conference have to be limited, the procedures to be followed will differ with the purposes. Suppose we consider two types of learning, one requiring the acquisition of information and another the changing of attitudes. Let us also suppose that the first conference is concerned with furnishing information about the nature of a new program of government support. It may be government support of farm production or it may be government support of institutions of higher education. The aim is to have those who attend the conference learn the nature of the new program. I suggest that such a conference should begin with a clear, concise presentation by a person who understands the new program. Such a presentation might well be limited to twenty or thirty minutes. It need not be comprehensive or detailed. In fact, I would urge that the emphasis be on clarity and conciseness rather than fullness and that it be designed to engage the attention of the conferees. Immediately following the presentation, which will have given the entire group a common experience, there can be a general discussion, during which questions are raised about what has been said and about some areas that were not covered by the initial presentation. This general discussion opens the way for individuals to get involved actively, and it can convey to the speaker some idea of how his talk has been understood. Moreover it should convey to the conference coordinator some indication of the interests and concerns of those in attendance.

Following the general discussion, there should be an opportunity for small groups to meet for a consideration of the implications of the new program and the procedures that would have to be followed to take advantage of it. The small groups make it possible for a greater number of individuals to participate actively and in a sense to test their understanding of what has been said, and this kind of testing is important in the learning process. Out of the small group meetings could come new sets of questions and a heightened interest in learning more about the new program of government support. This suggests that there should be another general session, during which additional information can be imparted in response to questions that have been raised by the small discussion groups. Undoubtedly the use of visual aids, such as charts, films, slides, and a limited amount of printed materials will aid to the likelihood of increased understanding on the part of the conferees.

If the material that has been presented is relevant to the interests of the conference participants, it will be discussed in such informal, interpersonal situations as exist. A well-timed coffee break provides such a situation, as do meal times and recreational periods. The greater the number of opportunities for an individual to talk about the information that has been presented, to speculate on its usefulness, and to discuss with others the way the new program might operate, the more likely one will learn the things that the planners of the conference hoped would be learned.

If the aim of a conference is to bring about a change in attitudes, the program might be planned quite differently. A little while ago I attended a conference, the aim of which was to bring about a change in attitude on the part of the members of a college faculty concerning what a college curriculum ought to be. I do not know the extent to which the aims of the planners of the conference will be achieved, but it seemed to me that they followed some practices that were fairly in keeping with good principles of learning. To begin with, the conference planners took account of the prestige or status factor that is so influential in affecting one's attitudes. In the first session of the program, they had as a speaker a very widely known educator who was able to call attention to the possibilities for change in improving higher education.

This presentation provided the means by which any member of the faculty could align himself to some extent with the prestigious individual by tentatively accepting the proposition that some change in the college curriculum might be a good thing.

Another sound policy that was followed was to recognize that all persons, including even college professors, have vested interests which they tend to protect. To remove the threat of destroying these vested interests, it seems to be essential for each person to establish himself as an individual of significance with the group, for once he feels that he has been recognized as a significant person he will feel more secure and more open to suggestions for change. Thus there need to be good opportunities for such persons to make themselves known.

However, if attitudes are to be changed, it is important that individuals do not take firm positions, for once having taken a position one often feels it necessary to defend and to hold onto that position.

Whenever the aim of a conference is to change attitudes, it is again important that the groups be small enough for each individual to express himself and to make use of his particular competence, whether it be that of a physicist, a historian, an artist, or a sociologist, or, if we are outside the field of higher education, as an engineer, a mechanic, a farmer, a union leader, a business executive.

Freedom from the pressures of one's job and freedom from the influences of the groups with which one ordinarily associates are helpful in enabling an individual to be open to a change in outlook or attitudes. To put it differently, one's attitudes are usually strongly influenced by the kinds of groups with which one associates, so if a person can see the conference as a member of a group that is open to change he can feel more comfortable about acceptance of new ideas. This again argues for the exploitation of the informal occasions—meals, social hours, and chance conversations. Moreover, there needs to be ample opportunity for contemplation by oneself for relaxation. Such periods might well be followed by sessions, either in small or larger groups, at which tentative proposals for change are advanced, but with no effort to reach a decision. Such sessions coupled with time for exploration of ideas, speculation about what would happen if certain suggestions were put into operation, tend to create a readiness for change in attitude. In some situations, the change in attitude may be reinforced if there is a search for agreement about the need for change or the directions in which change might be made. Again a person often needs to feel that he is in the swing of things and is moving along with others. In any event, the planners need to keep in mind that when we are concerned with changing attitudes, the aim is not to *furnish* information but to *use* information to the extent that is necessary to insure an intelligent consideration of the issues involved in achieving a new outlook.

I have tried to suggest some of the kinds of learning that are sought that might affect the nature of the program of a short residential conference, by talking about two ordinary kinds of learning, the acquisition of information and the changing of attitudes. If the purposes of a conference require other types of learning, the procedures to be followed might be quite different from those that have just been proposed.

It is because of the peculiar nature of the residential setting that the conditions for learning can be more easily and readily created than in some other settings. For most persons the residential conference is a change. It is in a novel environment, unless it is held in a motel or a hotel. Even then there are some novel aspects that can contribute to openness. In the residential situation relaxation comes easily. One is removed from the day-by-day strains and streams of the job. Because of the opportunities for frequent encounters in a variety of situations, interpersonal relations are facilitated and the possibilities for free communication are enhanced. Moreover, in the residential conference the worth of each individual can be recognized. This comes about not only through participation in small and large group meetings but through encounters in the dining room, in the lounges, in the sleeping rooms, around the card table, and during the social hours.

Fortunately, learning in the residential conference can be related to independent studies that may be carried on by individuals before or after the conference, with more formal extension and evening courses, and with organized reading. Observation of students enrolled in the adult degree program at Goddard College during its three and a half years of operation has shown that participation in the two-week-long residential periods, separated by five and a half months of independent study, results in early identification of the individual student with the group, and early development of a strong group spirit which seems to have the effect of stimulating a great deal of intellectual activity among the students. Apparently the feeling of membership in a group of adult learners is very supportive and stimulating. The interchange that occurs among the members of the group is a method by which individuals discover themselves and are discovered by others. It is the means by which new interests are developed, new careers are opened up, and new ambitions are aroused.

PRESENTATION TO THE CORRESPONDENCE STUDY DIVISION

FRIDAY, APRIL 21

THE CHANGING ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY IN SOCIETY

Lynn W. Eley
Dean, University College
Washington University

You are gathered to consider the role—no doubt the changing role—of university correspondence study in society. Given your experience in this field, you are in a good position to appreciate one of the most profound changes in the role of today's university. Students, at least the pacesetters, are demanding that they participate actively in the teaching and learning process. No spoon-feeding for them, no droning on in 50-minute segments. They want to pick the professor's brains, and if the professor cannot answer their questions about his subject in terms meaningful to them, they are prepared to protest. These students are forcing a fundamental reassessment of the relationship between student, professor, and subject matter, as well as between student and society. Let us discuss the former relationship first.

The pacesetting students of this college-age generation are accustomed to participating, and they are accustomed to viewing the older generations with more than the usual, historic resentment of the younger generation for the older. There are revolutionary dimensions present today, and they have only begun to reveal themselves. The writer Nat Hentoff has referred to this gap as "the widening generational chasm." One of the causes for the resentment is related to the enormity of the crimes, of both commission and omission, which today's youth lay at the doorstep of the generations of the Great Wars, of the almost successful extermination of a whole people, of the development and early use of The Bomb and other weapons of mass destruction, of the long and mournful night of racial discrimination and exploitation and man's inhumanity to man. This recital is too familiar—and probably too loathsome—to bear further elaboration. Barbara Tuchman has commented that the "implications for all of us" of World War II alone "have not yet . . . been fully measured." In the circumstances, many young people see little worth deferring to in the older generations. Our generations' failures, or thought-to-be failures, in practicing the brotherhood of man have produced an alienation from us and all our causes and works among the young people I'm talking about, and they are marching to a different drummer.

Another reason for the changing educational role of universities is bound up with advances in the processes of teaching and learning—psychological and methodological. Jerome S. Bruner—and now Marshall McLuhan—are the prophets, but not the creators, of this new Jerusalem. As McLuhan has pointed out, and as his interpreters have explained he has pointed out, today's young people have grown up in the age of television, and we oldtimers, used to the conventional classroom lecture situation, can hardly appreciate the education of the senses which television—and color television now—the Beatles, Mod clothes and style, have given our children. In our own time the intellect was to be educated; in our children's time, it is the senses as well as the intellect. Though I shrink from embracing all features of this revolution, including the awful noise which vibrates the house when my son's band, with electric guitars, is practicing in the basement, on the whole I conclude that these changes bring greater richness and color to our children's lives. Their capacity to live life to the fullest is increased.

How do these comments relate to my subject? The answer is that educational institutions are having to accommodate the thrusts of this new generation brought up on the new technology, and the effects are being felt as beginning shock waves in many nooks and crannies of our universities.

Curricular reforms, more varied offerings in the arts and humanities, calendar changes to allow more independent reading and study, the inauguration of pass-fail grading systems, the proliferation of year-abroad programs and study tours and residential experiences both abroad and in our own country, formal student participation in designing curricula and reforming degree requirements—these are a few of the evidences of student participation in the educational process. Enrichment in extracurricular programs is another rather direct outcome of the enlarged student involvement.

Not everything is onward and upward, however. While these students outshine us in most departments of knowledge and cultivation of the senses when we were their age, I do get concerned that a disproportionate share of their concerns seems to be with personal cultivation and enjoyment. I understand their disenchantment with the struggle for worldly success that the rest of us are prey to—or is it heir to? But where is the president of the General Motors Corporation of the future to come from? Or the telephone callers for the get-out-the-vote drive for the school bond issue? Today's young people all seem to want to be spectators; no one will strike out to lead. Perhaps my fears are groundless or misplaced; possibly these Mods will grow up to assume the daily obligations, sometimes very tedious indeed, of making our economy and our democracy work, and work better. The civil rights generation did give us all a lesson in youthful organization to serve human values, it must be recalled, and without those young people, this most vital domestic problem of the 1960's, perhaps of the Twentieth Century, would not have been confronted. And we must not forget that this was also the Peace Corps generation. Whether one agrees with their position on the Vietnam War or not (and I find myself not so much straddling the fence as leaning first on one side, then on the other), today's college youth are certainly letting us know that they have strong views on that War.

However, if you have seen the movie "Blow-Up," you must share my sense of horror over what that movie shows us about the Mod generation's lack of concern for the life and well-being of other human beings. Are we entering a new nightmare produced by the inhumanities already practiced in the Twentieth Century? Must we make the same mistakes all over again, though this time not from passionate hatred but from an absence of caring? Have we fled from commitment to estrangement and nihilism?

John Gardner puts the greater share of the blame for this state of affairs back on us, complaining "that we are immunizing a high proportion of our most gifted young people against any tendencies to leadership." First, he says, "the conditions of life in a modern, complex society are not conducive to the emergence of leaders," producing what he calls "unfocussed discouragement" among young people. Secondly, he notes, "Most of our intellectually gifted young people" go on to postgraduate work of one sort or another. "There they are introduced to—or, more correctly, powerfully indoctrinated in—a set of attitudes appropriate to scholars, scientists, and professional men." This is all right as far as it goes, Gardner continues, since we obviously need superior scholars, scientists, and professional men, but it doesn't go far enough. ". . . the only kind of leadership encouraged is that which follows from the performing of purely professional tasks in a superior manner. Entry into what most of us would regard as the leadership roles in the society at large is discouraged." The result is that "the academic world appears to be approaching a point at which everyone will want to educate the technical expert who advises the leader, or the intellectual who stands off and criticizes the leader, but no one will want to educate the leader himself."

Others are beginning to sound a similar refrain. Barbara Tuchman, in a speech to the recent national conference of the Association for Higher Education in Chicago, scored our generation for its "evasion of [moral] leadership." What our leaders and would-be leaders are doing, she maintains, is "scurrying around, collecting consensus, gathering as wide an acceptance as possible." She is terribly concerned about what they are not doing.

> "What they are not doing, very notably, is standing still and saying, 'This is what I believe. This I will do and that I will not do. This is my code of behavior and that is outside it. That is excellent and that is trash.' There is an abdication of moral leadership in the sense of a general unwillingness to state standards."

I wasn't brought here to give a sermon. Yet what I've just said and quoted are right on target, really. We have been alleging an important inadequacy in Twentieth Century higher education, an inadequacy with serious consequences for society at large, especially in light of the immense and growing prestige attached to our universities and university education.

What are we educators bound to do to supply what Barbara Tuchman labels "The Missing Element"? Fortunately, there are evidences that students—and particularly younger faculty members—are refusing to wait upon the professors for guidance on some matters of leadership and public policy anyway. Their involvement in civil rights, anti-poverty projects, the Peace Corps, and anti-war protests suggests that these young people care enough to engage in leadership for certain causes.

Let us move on to another topic. It overstates the case, I realize, to ascribe the gradual changes in the learning environment of universities to the demands of new college-age youth. Faculties, yes, and even we maligned administrators, have played a role. We have built on the insight of John Dewey that people learn better when they are involved actively and affirmatively in the teaching and learning situation. We have grasped the fact that students can make important contributions to understanding and the advancement of knowledge, as I remember Roger Revelle, then dean of university research at the University of California, pointing out to me in terms of eloquence some years back. Also, developing technology is compelling us to turn to newer methods and procedures of pedagogy, utilizing television and other mass media, programmed instruction, and so forth. Some of the university correspondence study and extension divisions are important pioneers in the utilization of the newer media for adult learners, as for instance the University of Wisconsin in its Articulated Instructional Media project.

Actually, I guess I've begun discussing a third major change in the role of universities in society: the accelerating expansion in their use of the new educational media, the hardware of teaching and learning. This change is visualized by oracles of higher education more than it is an accomplished fact, however, and I find a great deal of faculty misgiving and ambivalence about the gadgetry. Indeed, I think the promoters and the hailers of a new era of learning effectiveness have taken one step backward to their earlier two leaps forward. The results from giving courses over television or radio have not been that sensational. For all their seeming impatience and impertinence, children and youth—and adult learners, too—want to have some sort of *personal* communication with a live-and lively-instructor. Partly this desire is a reaction against the dehumanization of our bureaucratically-oriented and-dominated lives; partly it is an affirmative yearning for the human instead of the merely intellectual or sensory aspects of education. Somehow we still want our psyches engaged, not just our brains.

So now most educators see the role of the new technology as supplementary rather than exclusive, with a live instructor or preceptor, or team of instructors, supplying the tie that binds the subject matter together and the student to the subject. Charles E. Silberman expresses it well in his recent article in *Fortune* on "Technology Is Knocking at the Schoolhouse Door": ". . . the teacher will become a diagnostician, tutor, and Socratic leader rather than a drillmaster. . . ."

There is at least one other difficulty which stands in the way of massive increases in the use of the new media. It is the uneven and generally mediocre quality of the educational programming. With a few notable exceptions, like the University of Michigan's educational television programs, university efforts have been pretty dismal. The reason is not hard to find: individually most universities lack the resources of money, production talent, and distribution outlets needed to make educational television and the other media the conveyors of really first-rate education.

Are these resources to be forthcoming in our society? I believe so, largely from government and private business. It is probably only a question of time until Congress is persuaded to establish public educational television on a national basis, as proposed this session by the Ford and Carnegie Foundations and the Johnson administration. But will universities be in the TV picture? Pretty much as consumers rather than producers, I predict. Some of their faculty members will be pulled in as script-writers and teacher-performers; universities, however, will have little institutional participation in producing the teaching programs.

I also speculate that the universities will eventually find themselves users instead of producers where computerization is concerned. What I am foreseeing is probably quite a long way off, but I think that it may be inevitable. The developing technology requires larger and larger aggregations of capital, productive know-how, and markets, and at some point even a multi-university or association of universities is too small a unit to be economically viable in acquiring and operating the production hardware of higher education.

What then is the role of the university when that inevitable day dawns? I presume it will still be vitally concerned with transmitting knowledge and culture to the on-coming generations and, increasingly, to adult generations. Just as its faculty did not write most of the books in the library or paint most of the pictures in the art collection, so its faculty will not star on the national educational television channels or develop and operate the national computer data center used by the faculty and the students. No doubt faculty will still explicate and interpret, counsel and intercede. There is no clear sign that these functions will atrophy or become extinct.

We turn now, abruptly, to a fourth major change in the role of the university: its new role in assisting and aften producing social change. The federal government is trying to unleash the knowledge and skills of our social and physical scientists to solve the staggering problems of our cities, just as a generation or two ago our agricultural scientists and extension specialists revolutionized agricultural production in the nation. And now the involvement of the artists and designers is not far behind. What we are witnessing is the development of a remarkable partnership in societal problem-solving—in both domestic and international terms—between government at all levels, private business, and the universities.

I say remarkable, because yesterday's conservative or liberal, say of the Middle New Deal period, would think he had lost his political bearings if he returned now to find huge corporations running educational and social action projects financed by tax funds and serving the down-and-outers as well as the affluent and gifted. Many examples might be cited; let me cite one which concerns the McGraw Hill Book Company. This example also drives home the point about private companies being in the educational technology business. McGraw Hill has an ad running now in the *Saturday Review*, and probably other magazines, which reads, in part as follows:

> McGraw-Hill Book Company—A publisher who doesn't always go by the book.
>
> Whether it's a packaged science program for first graders that channels the natural curiosity of a child into meaningful discovery.

Or a typing course for fourth, fifth, and sixth graders designed to improve language arts skills.

Or a definitive series of books on Communist China and the challenge it presents to the free world.

Or a series of thought-provoking films for teen-agers dramatically exploring the problems and consequences of premarital sex and pregnancy.

Or a programmed reading course for adults to help break the cycle of illiteracy, unemployment, economic deprivation, and illiteracy again.

Or a series of grade school readers addressed to the multi-cultural realities of our time.

There's a common denominator.

Awareness of today's social economic, and political responsibilities.

Constant exploration of human learning and understanding. Participation in the education process itself. Utilization of the advances being made in science and technology. Innovation in designing and developing the right combination of materials for the specific job to be done.

Books. Tapes. Records. Films. Instructional Systems.

They're all part of our business. Part of an exciting revolution in education, information, and entertainment. A revolution that will never end.

Permit me to add one more example. Some weeks ago it was my pleasure to fly from St. Louis to San Francisco via jet, and all the way I was culturally enriched by listening to TWA's Adventures in Sound. I heard symphonies and popular favorites performed by leading orchestras and bands and great moments in sports reproduced from contemporary tapes and records. Unfortunately, this particular flight was not equipped for movies and TV, but many long distance flights are. Probably most of you have had similarly enjoyable flights. I don't want to equate all of this with higher education, but I do want to emphasize that there is an explosion of cultural and educational activity in our society, and while higher education is involved, it is only one institution among many which is contributing to this revolution in learning. And I'm suggesting that in the future—as in many instances in the present, I should add—it may be far from the most important contributor. In many areas it will be merely responding to and implementing the grand strategies and programs designed by other institutions—government, private corporations, foundations, and other associations and organizations.

Charles E. Silberman is worth citing again, on the decentralization of knowledge. It is his opinion that

> "the new information and teaching technologies will greatly accelerate the decentralization of knowledge and education that began with the book. Because of television and the mass media, not to mention the incredible proliferation of education and training courses conducted by business firms and the armed forces, the schools (he is referring to elementary and high schools) are already beginning to lose their copyright on the word education."

Silberman celebrates the accelerating decentralization, commenting that it could bring us back to "the classic Platonic and Jeffersonian concepts of education as a process carried on by the citizen's participation in the life of his community."

As Silberman sees it, this development will eventually compel schools—and universities, we might add—"to take account of the fact that students learn outside school as well as (and perhaps as much as) in school. Schools will, in consequence, have to start concentrating on the things they can teach best." Individualized instruction, he seems to imply, may turn out in the long run to be one of the things schools can do best.

Vast infusions of financial resources and talent will be necessary if the universities are to continue to play a significant educational role in the future great society. In this respect, the increase in federal governmental support for higher education during the 1960's is dramatic and hopefully pregnant with long term possibility. Douglas Cater, special assistant to President Johnson for education, has pointed out that just in the past three years "we have witnessed a revolution in the federal commitment to education, high and low." He notes that nineteen major education measures have been enacted into law during that period. President Johnson has submitted appropriation requests for three times as much money for higher education as was spent by the federal government in 1960. Consider this statistic cited by Cater: "The federal share of total national expenditures for higher education is now passing the twenty-five per cent mark." And remember, this says nothing about the rapid increase in state and local support of higher education.

Of course these data include spending for all purposes: university-based research, facilities, equipment, and institutional development, support of undergraduate, graduate, and professional training. In all these areas, presumably the surface has only been scratched. To take one or two small examples of the mushrooming demands, a panel of the President's Science Advisory Commitee has just urged the federal government to share substantially in the costs of putting computers on campuses throughout the country. University students by the 1970's must learn about computers, the panel declared, or be as handicapped as those of their predecessors who could not operate a typewriter or drive a car. A second example: with the passage of the International Studies Act last year, the federal government greatly enlarged its involvement in the support of university training programs in international studies.

And what of government support of continuing education and community service programs? Here it is manifestly clear that the surface has barely been scratched. But a significant beginning has been made. We are in the midst of a changing role here too, with university faculties, students, and administrators—I think Dean John Munro of Harvard College is the finest example drawn from the administrator class—rushing to assist the disadvantaged and bind up some of the wounds of our urban-centered society. Some do their community service for professional reasons, some for money, some for a desire to serve, and in most cases these motives are intertwined. This burgeoning of community service and problem-solving is, in my view, one of the most hopeful happenings on the nation's campuses. I know that some of our colleagues wonder who is going to be left to tend the university store, so to speak, but most of us would agree that this extramural service, particularly where it involves the application of professional knowledge and talent to society's problems, both here and abroad, is integrally related to tending the store, and the store is likely to be better off as a result. We must designate extramural service as still another instance of the changing role of universities in society. Society, through government and in other ways, is appealing to the universities for help, and the universities are responding.

There are some real problems and dangers in this area, and a few have already surfaced. I detect a conflict oftentimes between the financial and administrative requirements which government feels it must impose to meet its public responsibility, and the flexibility and absence of technicalities which universities feel they need to serve the public interest best. Title I of the Higher Education Act and the State Technical Services Act are two federal programs which, worthy as they are in the eyes of university officials, sometimes drive them to distraction and beyond. The honeymoon of our partnership is over and we must now assume the obligations of living together in ordinary times.

Larger problems and issues may be glimpsed. I fear, for example, that government and society look to universities for all-embracing panaceas and for instant successes, as was done in the Project Head-Start training contract between NUEA and OEO some years back. We are not equipped for such a universal role, and I'm not sure that it is proper, or possible, for us to be so equipped. One thing I am sure of: I don't think it is the proper role of universities to set the larger society's goals and preempt its decision-making functions. I have heard Eugene Johnson of the Adult Education Association say things that led me to think he did want us to play this role in our cities, but I am convinced that setting our course in that direction would be folly. In any event, we aren't capable of playing the philosopher-king role, and society would soon banish us if we tried. I want our elected political leaders to call the main shots. God save us if idealogues and technologists take over!

Universities also have a continuing role, often honored in the breach, of standing above the tumult and casting stones of fundamental criticism at society. The dilemma we as higher educators confront is that of how we train tomorrow's leaders properly, assist today's society in coping with its most vexing problems, and where needed, challenge the fundamental values of today's and tomorrow's generations. At some points along the scale of course, these interests may coincide, at others, two or all three may be in profound conflict. If we allow our appetite for government funds and exciting projects to lay our principles of institutional independence and integrity on the line, we are in a bad way indeed. And in the cases of Project Camelot, the MSU Vietnam Project, and other projects within recent months, this has obviously happened.

Possibly the development of institutional systems of colleges and universities will help the university to maintain an instrumental role in higher education and as an agent of social change. Samuel B. Gould, chancellor of the State University of New York, notes that one of the characteristics of change in our colleges and universities, both public and private, is amalgamation or confederation "into coordinated groups for purposes of gaining collective strength, sharing facilities and personnel, and often participating in curricular development which no single one of the institutions could encompass by itself." We should earmark this federation movement as another instance of change affecting our universities.

Let me return to the university's developing role in community service and continuing education. I have alluded to the university's new role in working with the disadvantaged of society and in attempting to solve society's immediate problems. There is another point which must be considered. It is one made well by my colleague Leonard Stein, dean of Metropolitan College of St. Louis University: important as programs for the undereducated are, the major role of university continuing education henceforth is likely to be in providing educational programs for the already educated. Junior and community colleges and institutions of higher education are proliferating throughout the country. College, at least the first two years, is within the geographic and financial reach of most Americans for the first time. There has been an immense expansion in both the absolute and relative numbers of persons who attend college. We should pause at this point long enough to observe that here is another fundamental change in the role of universities in society. With President Johnson, we believe today that every American who is a high school graduate and can benefit from going to college, should be able to do so. This belief is not yet universally accepted, but it appears to have the support of most Americans. In any event, our planning for the future rests on this basic value.

One of the fastest growing areas in our field is continuing professional education, which is generally at the post-baccalaureate level. By and large, let me state parenthetically, university extension administrators are being left at the gate by the professional school on their campuses, and they have little or nothing to do with this notable development. Similarly the NUEA as an organization has failed thus far to take any initiative to work out an organic relationship to the field of continuing professional education, a serious failure indeed.

The major points I've made about the changing role of universities in society may be summarized as follows:

(1) Students are demanding active participation in the teaching and learning process, and are contributing to a fundamental reassessment of the relationship between student, professor, and subject.

(2) Universities are neglecting the conscious and systematic education of the young for leadership in the larger society.

(3) University utilization of the new educational media is expanding, but apparently universities will be consumers more than producers of the new media.

(4) Universities are increasingly involved in assisting and often producing social change.

(5) They are increasingly merely one of many institutions in the field of education; education is decentralized and remarkably dispersed throughout society, with the individual enabled more and more to educate himself through the process of community living.

(6) Partnership, with some strains in the relationship, is emerging in education and in social action between government (at all levels), business, and universities and schools.

(7) Colleges and universities are engaged in developing increasingly elaborate systems of institutional cooperation and coordination, and these may assist such federations or associations in maintaining a significant role in education and social action, though this is by no means certain.

(8) Universities are increasingly involved in continuing education and community service programs:

- (a) As noted earlier, faculties, students, and administrators have been rushing to bind up the wounds of our urban-centered society, to assist the disadvantaged, to establish the civil rights of minorities. This work must continue.
- (b) A major role from now on will be the continuing education of the already educated, to help them realize their own greatest potential, to assist in social decision-making, and to improve the quality of community life for all of us.

PRESENTATION TO THE CONFERENCES AND INSTITUTES DIVISION

SATURDAY, APRIL 22

SOCIOLOGICAL BACKGROUNDS AND RATIONALE FOR LEARNING IN SHORT-TERM SETTINGS

Wilbur Brookover
Professor of Education, Michigan State University

As you are aware I was asked to discuss with you the problem of short-term learning from the point of view of a sociologist. The focus of my remarks, therefore, is on the sociological aspects of the learning process. I trust they have some relevance to learning in short-term settings. I understand, however, that it is not my responsibility to explain how my comments may be applied to the short-term learning situation. I will, however, attempt to make some suggestions concerning the possible relevance of our examination of social determinants of learning.

My interest in a social psychological conception of learning emerged out of my dissatisfaction with the prevalent conception of learning ability. As I observed American education, the underlying assumption is a conception of fixed learning ability. Although not always made explicit, it is generally assumed that this fixed ability is genetically determined. Throughout the elementary, secondary, undergraduate, and graduate school education much of our practice of selection and allocation of people to various levels and types of education is undergirded by the assumption that only a limited proportion of the American students have whatever ability it takes to learn certain kinds of behavior. A major concern in the system, therefore, is the selection of students who will be admitted to various levels and types of educational programs. Although we have long since learned that our intelligence or aptitude tests do not measure any innate fixed ability, our educational system functions as if this were true.

A few decades ago a related assumption that older people could not learn new patterns of behavior prevailed in American society. The early standardization of the intelligence tests was based upon the assumption that learning limits were reached at about sixteen years of age. The adult educators of America have long since discarded this perception of human maturation. They developed a program of education which assumes that human beings continue to learn throughout life. There is little indication that adult educators are greatly influenced by the predominant belief in fixed abilities to learn. Rather, I believe you operate on the assumption that adult human beings can learn to behave in new ways at any time and in any appropriate situation. At least I have known few adult educators who sought to determine in advance whether or not a client had the ability to learn the kinds of behavior or knowledge presented in either a conference or a longer educational program. Because of this I assume that much of what I will say is more attuned to your basic assumptions than to those commonly held by educators of younger people.

I should like to turn at this point to the identification of what to me are basic postulates in a sociological or social psychological conception of human learning. The first is that human beings have a very wide range if not an unlimited ability to learn. An observation of human beings around the world demonstrates a great variety of human behavior. There is no evidence to indicate that members of any one society could not if given the opportunity learn the types of behavior provided in any or every other society. Furthermore, there is ample evidence that people who have already learned the appropriate kinds of language and other behaviors in one social system readily learn quite different behaviors as they move to a different society. This suggests as Robert Faris has maintained that society determines the type of learning and the abilities needed by human beings at any time and in any circumstance.

As Faris has indicated, "we have turned away from the concept of human ability as something fixed in the physiological structure to that of a flexible and versatile mechanism subject to great improvement. Upper physiological limits of performance may eventually be shown to exist, but it seems certain that these are seldom if ever reached in any person, and in most of the population the levels of performance actually reached have virtually no relation to innate capacities.

"Thus, the amount of ability in each person is created in the course of experience, and the supply of ability in any society is, at present, a consequence mainly of impersonal social processes rather than intentional control.

"Any society tends automatically to reproduce its level of achieved ability among its members. The most obvious factor in this continuity is the richness of the social heritage. . . . The fund of knowledge stored in print and accessible to the population is a major component of the framework of collective ability.

"The central implication of the present argument is that attractive potentialities of increase in collective ability are possible if we advance our knowledge of the sociological influences that stimulate and limit aspiration and achievement, and find strategic points at which we may establish some control over them."

The programs of adult education and your particular concern with learning in short-term situations reflect this postulate to a considerable degree. I am, therefore, not inclined to prolong the discussion of the range of human abilities available in any society. Rather, let us proceed on the assumption that human beings have whatever ability is necessary to learn the kinds of behavior that are essential for the society in which they live.

The second postulate that I would like to identify is closely related to the first. It is that essentially 100 per cent of all human beings learn the common cultural behaviors in the society of which they are a part. Thus, it is evident to any casual observer that practically all human beings learn the language of their associates, they learn the appropriate patterns of male or female behavior, the patterns of appropriate dress and a wide range of other common culturally defined behaviors. Although the definitions of appropriate behavior change to some degree from time to time, human beings in every society learn whatever these behaviors may be.

Out of these basic observations or postulates I have developed somewhat more specific hypotheses concerning the learning of human beings. The first of these is that human beings learn to behave in terms of what each perceives others think is appropriate, proper and what they expect of him. This hypothesis implies that the models of behavior presented to the individual and the communications from those important to him provide the means through which the individual acquires a perception of what is appropriate and proper for him to learn.

Out of this perception of the other's behavior and the communications from relevant associates, we hypothesize that the individual develops a self-conception of what is appropriate and proper for *him* in any given situation. This self-concept of what is appropriate is acquired in interaction with those others whose response is valued by the actor. These people we identify as significant others.

In a similar manner we hypothesize that each person develops a conception of what he is able to learn. A self-concept of his ability. This self-concept of ability is also acquired through interaction with people whose evaluation of him is considered relevant. Evidence from an extensive longitudinal study of high school students demonstrates that such self-concepts of ability are highly correlated with school achievement and set the limits of school achievement for most students.

Such self-concepts of ability are also highly correlated with the individual's perception of what significant others such as parents, teachers and friends think of his ability. We hypothesize, therefore, that the individual will not learn patterns of behavior that he perceives that he is not able to learn. Some individuals, however, do not learn to behave in ways that they feel they are able to learn. In other words a sizable proportion of students who feel that they have the ability to achieve at a high level in school do not do so. Although we do not have extensive evidence to support this point, we hypothesize that this results from the fact that they do not perceive it is appropriate or necessary for them to learn these types of behavior. Thus, a student might perceive that he is able to learn science or mathematics but does not see it as something that is appropriate for him or expected of him.

The general framework of our theory, therefore, is that individuals learn to behave in the ways that the people who are important to them consider desirable, expected, proper and in the ways that they feel that they are able to learn. Although we do not have data on adults, I would speculate that the same theory is relevant for adults as well as for students in school. Whether or not you can create a kind of learning environment in a short-term situation to implement this theory is for you to discuss. As I would see it, it would be necessary for the adult student to acquire the perception that it was proper and appropriate for him to learn new patterns of behavior quickly and that he is able to do so. Such a perception could be acquired from the association or interaction with people who are significant to him and who hold such expectations for them.

I should like to turn at this point to an examination of some learning activities which provide some evidence to support the general postulates in short-term kinds of learning situations. None of these are gathered from adult education conference type situations, but I think they may have some relevance for your area of concern.

We have already noted that human beings rather readily learn new ways of behaving as they move from one society or community or group to another. We are all aware of the fact that persons migrating from one society to another generally learn in a relatively short time the common modes of behavior in dress, style of life and language of the new society. Perhaps less obvious but equally relevant are the changes in various aspects of behavior as one moves from one sub-segment of a given society or one group to a different one. Data from public opinion and various other studies demonstrate that members of particular sub-strata or sub-groups in the society tend to have similar patterns of behavior and similar attitudes and opinions. Business organizations and schools and colleges generally provide a brief short-term orientation of some sort to accomplish this kind of learning. If formal orientations are not provided, the new employee of a business or educational organization generally seeks out from the older members to acquire the appropriate patterns of behavior in that particular unit. In other words each learns the rules of the game and the ways to get along in the particular group or organization.

Perhaps somewhat more dramatic and sudden short-term learning is illustrated by the changes in behavior of students who come to a campus for the first time. A limited comparison of patterns of dress, dating habits and other student sub-cultural norms would demonstrate that these vary considerably from one college campus to another. Observation of the students, a week or so after arrival on campus, also demonstrates that the newly arrived students have already acquired the appropriate patterns of behavior on the particular campus. A few years ago Michigan State University girls wore saddle shoes and ankle sox. Today it is loafers and hose. I was informed a few days ago, however, that the former are coming back. If they do, all the freshmen next fall will know and wear saddle shoes and anklets within a day or two after they arrive.

A few days ago I was asked to do a study to determine why almost 100% of Michigan State students attended nearly all the football games and only a minor fraction attended other athletic contests such as basketball, baseball, and hockey. We developed an elaborate set of hypotheses concerning their previous experience, their preference for various sports, the importance of the various sports in their high school, the time of the games on campus, and a variety of other variables. After careful study the representative sample of our students, we found that none of the hypotheses about previous socialization preference for various sports or section of the country or state from which they came made any difference whatsoever in their athletic attendance patterns at MSU. Students from Indiana or the Upper Peninsula of Michigan where basketball was the major sport and where the students had always attended basketball games and did not know anything about football, were just as likely to attend football games at Michigan State and were just as likely not to attend basketball games on campus as were students from high schools where football was the major sport. This was as true among first quarter freshmen as it was of sophomores, juniors and seniors. The previous patterns of athletic attendance and preference made absolutely no difference in the athletic attendance at Michigan State. It seemed obvious from our analysis that the explanation was not in previous socialization but in the norms of student behavior that prevailed on our campus. Here the expectations and definitions of what is proper and appropriate behavior include football game attendance while attendance at basketball, hockey or baseball is an alternate pattern of behavior. The latter is permitted but not expected or required. The whole social system of the campus is organized around football on football weekends. Every student learns this the minute he arrives if he has not already acquired that knowledge before coming to campus. This illustrates short-term learning and almost 100 per cent success in the short-term learning of new behavior patterns.

Similar evidence is available in some studies of changes in attitudes. A few years ago I directed a study of attitudes toward minority groups in a rural Michigan county. We did a rather intensive study of a sample of adults in this community. Among other things we asked respondents to indicate whether or not they thought it was a good idea to have Negroes move into the house next door or on the farm down the road. In all but one of ten rural neighborhoods in which we asked this question about 9 out of 10 respondents indicated that it was not a good idea. In one neighborhood, however, the situation had changed. A young Negro couple had just prior to our interviewing moved into this neighborhood and the responses of the neighbors were drastically different. No one in that neighborhood thought it was desirable to do anything about a Negro moving into the neighborhood. And all disagreed with the notion that it was a good idea to keep Negroes out. In fact the people in this neighborhood had welcomed the young Negro couple to the local rural church, they had had a neighborhood housewarming and a variety of other activities that were normal for the rural neighborhood behavior. Perhaps most interesting of all was the observation of some people that this young couple were not Negroes. As one young woman said, "They say that they are Negro but they are pretty white." The fact of the matter was they had the darkest skins of the small group of Negroes in that community. Other observations that we made revealed that the kinds of attitudes particular individuals expressed about minority groups varied greatly from one situation to another. A person's behavior toward Negroes or other minorities depended on the group in which they were participating at the particular time.

This point is further demonstrated in a study of segregation in the nation's capital which was directed by Joseph Lohman a few years ago. As a part of that study, one of Mr. Lohman's associates analyzed the attitudes of government employees who had moved from one agency to another. This study was done shortly after World War II when there were different patterns of integration in various agencies in the federal government. In some offices Negroes were segregated and discriminated against in employment. In other offices Negroes were integrated and their employment was on an equal basis. Government employees moving from one agency to another changed their behavior and attitudes toward minorities in accord with the norms of the agency in which they were employed. Individuals moving from an integrated agency to a segregated one become segregationist and prejudiced. And, those moving from segregated to integrated changed in that direction. This provides some evidence that the postulates which we have enunciated are relevant to adult learning and that they hold to the extent that people do learn to behave in the ways that are defined as appropriate, proper and expected by the people around them and who are important to them.

I am sure that you who are working in the field of short-term learning can readily interpret the theory and evidence that I have presented for your kind of learning situation. It may stimulate your discussion however, to suggest some of the variables in this theory that you might need to identify in order to adapt the learning situation most effectively.

Perhaps the first question you would want to ask is who are the significant others to whom your clientele refer themselves? The answers to this question, of course, may be either the groups with whom they associate, groups to whom they refer themselves, but do not associate or significant individuals in their realm of interaction who may or may not be members of their reference groups. This, of course, seems rather obvious on the surface but there is possible error in the identification of the significant persons in any realm of interaction. The term reference group was coined to point up this possibility. An individual may not always refer himself for evaluation to the people with whom he associates in his immediate environment. Upward mobile persons in an organization are likely to refer themselves to higher status persons and groups than to their associates at the same level. This was demonstrated during World War II when it was found that non-commissioned officers who were well thought of and well adjusted in their non-commissioned role were less likely to be successful in officers' training or as commissioned officers than enlisted personnel who were dissatisfied with their enlisted status and referred themselves to the commissioned officers' group to which they aspired. For these the reference group was the commissioned officers rather than colleagues at the enlisted level. Although significant individuals are generally identified with the reference group, we frequently make errors in this regard also. For example, it is commonly assumed that parents of adolescents are less likely to be significant persons than they were at an earlier stage. Coleman, for example, assumed in his study of adolescent society that the high school student peer group is most important in determining the norms of appropriate and expected behavior. Data we have obtained from a junior high school and high school population over a period of six years indicates, however, that parents are consistently named by almost a hundred per cent of the students in response to two questions designed to identify significant others. Peers are more likely to be named in the later adolescent high school years but at no time during the secondary school period are they named by anything like the same proportion as are parents. This evidence, contrary to popular view, suggests that we must be cautious in accepting the contemporary beliefs of social scientists with regard to the points of reference for one's evaluation.

It is important to recognize also that the person or groups to whom an individual refers himself in evaluating appropriate and proper behavior may change from one arena of behavior to another. Persons whose opinions are valued in on the job behavior may be quite irrelevant to the individual in evaluating his own behavior as a father or husband or church worker. It is therefore essential that we identify the arena within which behavior is to occur in order to identify the persons whose expectations are likely to effect changes in behavior of particular adult students.

The director of short-term learning programs would do well to determine what types of behavior the significant others expect in the areas of behavior on which the conference focuses. If the significant persons and groups already expect the kinds of behavior to which you are trying to lead the client, the battle is already well over. The short-term experience is more likely to be fruitful in this situation if you concentrate on communicating what these significant others expect and the ways and means of changing. If, on the other hand the clients' significant others do not approve the kinds of behavior to which you are trying to lead him or they do not approve change in present patterns of behavior—you probably can accomplish very little by trying to change these particular clients. Your focus might well then be on change in the leaders who are significant to them. This, of course, raises a related question concerning the acceptability of behavior change. If you are dealing with clientele in which the relevant groups do not value progress or change in behavior, the impact of short-term experience may be very limited. But if the groups' norms favor progress or change in behavior, the identification of desirable changes may be adequate to modify the presently accepted patterns of behavior. Although I have only a stereotyped picture of conference groups, I suspect that participation in a conference is some evidence of the acceptability of change in the relevant reference groups. I have been in one or two conferences however where I felt that the opposite was true. The purpose of the conference was not to bring about change in behavior but was to solidify the norms of traditional behavior and prevent the learning of distorted unacceptable ideas. On at least one occasion I was asked to speak to a conference group where I assumed the participants were moving in new directions and discovered after my presentation that this was completely unacceptable. I was expected by all concerned to give them reasons and justifications for not changing their behavior.

Another question that might well be asked is whether or not there is consensus on the patterns of appropriate behavior among persons who are in the relevant reference groups and are significant others. If all such persons and groups agree on the appropriate patterns of behavior it's unlikely that an outsider or an adult education director can have much impact except in the direction on which all agree. But if there is extensive variation or divergence among relevant others and groups, this divergence provides the arena within which the influence of one or the other may be enhanced and thus tip the scales in the direction of a particular type of behavior. The strategy of the short-term learning situation would therefore be dependent upon the extent of consensus or variation in the definitions of what is appropriate and proper behavior. In some cases you may wish to exploit the divergence and others you may wish to try to solidify consensus in a particular direction.

Another question that I think you would want to ask but one about which I can say very little is: what are the effective channels for communicating the norms or the changes in norms desired? I am not a specialist in communication or in the identification of appropriate channels or media. I suspect, however, that the appropriate media and channels vary with the particular clients or participants in the short-term learning situation.

The last question I would ask is: What are the clients' self-concepts of their ability to change? I assume that you generally have the appropriate self-concepts among conference goers. I assume that participants in such short-term learning situations which are generally voluntary would not be there if they did not perceive themselves as able to learn anything at the conference. If, however, you have situations in which the participants have not volunteered or otherwise feel that it is undesirable or impossible for them to learn, you certainly would find knowledge of participants' self-concepts relevant. If they perceive that they are unable to learn the new desired ways of behaving, I would hypothesize that you are unlikely to have much impact in any short-term learning situation unless you can focus your attention on changing the self-concept of the participants. It is, of course, possible that some participants think it is quite feasible for others to learn new ways of behaving but have a perception of themselves as non-learners of these new patterns. They may participate in the conference only because of the good fellowship and with the expectation that their colleagues will have acquired the new knowledge and the new ways of doing things. If there are such participants then some effort should be made to enhance their significant others' evaluation of the participants. This in turn should affect the participants concepts of themselves.

In summary, as a sociologist I would emphasize that human beings can learn whatever the appropriate and proper and expected patterns of behavior may be. They can and do learn new patterns of behavior very readily if the norms and the expectations of the group to whom they refer themselves require and expect such changes. To the extent that short-term learning situations can be organized to mobilize these forces they will be effective.

PRESENTATION TO THE CONFERENCES AND INSTITUTES DIVISION

SATURDAY, APRIL 22

HOW DOES SHORT-TERM LEARNING FULFILL SOCIETAL NEEDS?

Robert Blakely
Editorial Writer, *Chicago Daily News*

I.

Let us define terms.

By "short-term learning" I will refer to workshops, conferences and institutes conducted for adults by American universities—for convenience, "conferences."

In "societal needs" I will include concern for both the needs of individuals and the needs of the several societies they belong to. In "societal needs," moreover, I will include concern for both the need for specialized knowledge and the need for more general understanding.

But how should we interpret the first two words, " *How does* short-term learning fulfill societal needs?" It could call for both a general assessment of current performances and for an identification of some of the chief factors that make conferences effective, when they are effective. Obviously I can't make a general assessment, and yet we do need some idea of what societal needs are and how well they are being met if we are to judge what an effective conference, or conference program, is.

I am going to take some cues from the Report on Adult Education that the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults made for the U.S. Office of Education in 1965. *Adult Education*, Summer 1966, carries an article on the study, by A. A. Liveright, who made it. I quote from the summary of that report:

"Never before have the social and individual needs and forces in the U.S. called so strongly for a well-conceived and far-reaching program of continuing education. In response to these needs, adult education activities are growing rapidly and they are moving beyond the older vocational and agricultural emphases. This growth is however a fragmented, disorganized, unplanned and lopsided growth. It provides many opportunities for the well-to-do but it involves only peripherally the workers, the poor, and the unemployed. Adult education is still predominantly oriented toward vocational and professional interests. Education for civic and social competence is almost completely lacking. The largest part of adult education is now being offered by institutions outside of the regular educational framework. The future growth in adult education is likely to be an explosive one.

"In the face of the social needs and the inevitable growth in adult education, the field and the profession of adult education are not now equipped or organized to meet the need.

"There are however some important resources: A number of excellent and dedicated adult educators; some scattered prototype and demonstration programs; new agencies and institutions entering the field; a national climate favoring adult education; recent legislative and administrative developments at the national level make possible more effective planning in the future. If we are to build upon these resources, to meet the urgent needs for adult education, to make possible the 'Great Society' and to capitalize on the present favorable climate, there is, however, a compelling need for more and better leadership in the field."

If you subtract the references to "recent legislative and administrative developments at the national level," this description closely resembles the picture that emerged from the several studies the Fund for Adult Education sponsored in 1951-53.[1] At relevant points it seems to me to be a fair description of university conferences for adults as I saw them between 1951 and 1963. I submit it as a useful assessment of the current performances of conferences today, to the extent that I will use it.

Keeping it in mind for reference, I turn to identify some of the factors that make conferences effective, when they are effective.

Our title defines conferences as "short-term." We should note also that they are intensive. Therefore they call for more careful planning and execution than do longer, intermittent programs, such as courses, where there is time for second thoughts and modifications. The educator should try to achieve a total effect by the most exquisite harmonizing of all the elements. One of the elements is the university. Another element is the participants—participants who are *adult*, who, moreover, usually have some kind of cohesiveness lacking in random public meetings and school classes. While I am going to analyze this subject into its factors, I want to begin and end by considering the whole.

My first suggestion is that educators have much more to learn than they seem to have learned from the way of thinking called "systems analysis and planning." As this method is used in business and industry, it has five steps:

---

[1] See *Learning Comes of Age*, by John Walker Powell, Association Press, New York, 1956. The chief sources of this book are the eight studies referred to above. Powell lists them in his Preface.

First, the problem is stated as precisely as possible.

Second, a solution is conceived—one based on theory and analysis.

Third, the necessary parts of the proposed solution are specified as precisely as possible.

Fourth, the solution is tested and evaluated.

Fifth, where possible, the results from each step are fed back to the conceptual solution and it is modified accordingly.

If the application of this method to education is to mean more than the parroting of jargon, such as "input," "output" and "feedback," it calls for hard, sharp thinking in terms of wholes and parts; in terms of ends and appropriate means; and in terms of process that is coherent from the conception to the follow-through. Conducting a conference is like painting with water colors—everything has to be as right as possible the first time. "Feedback" may be valuable—for the next time, if there is a next time.

Turning now to the separate factors of a conference, I will use the familiar newspaper catalog of essential questions: "Who?" "What?" "Where," "Why?" and "How?"—omitting "When?" because you are not likely to have much control over this factor.

* * *

The governing question of a conference—first in time and always present *as a guide*—should be "Why?" That is, what are the objectives? A searching answer to "Why?" would, I think, lead to the decision not to hold many of the conferences now conducted. The conclusion might be that the objectives are not educational and are more appropriate for a noneducational organization; or that the objectives are educational but are more appropriate for some educational agency other than a university; or that the objectives are appropriate for a university but could be better achieved by some means other than a conference. (This sentence alludes to technological developments that I will handle later.) In any event, a sharp look at objectives never results in a routine performance. Each proposed conference is viewed freshly. If the decision is to do what has been done before, it is made on the grounds that such is fitting, not because the ruts have already been cut. If no tracks lead into an important field, this fact stirs the question, "Why not?"

Here I refer to the Center's survey of adult education, from which I quoted: "Education for civic and social competence is almost completely lacking." This is a Dark Continent teeming with objectives that are educational, that are appropriate for universities, that are appropriate for conferences—objectives abundant, both as primary purposes and as secondary purposes.

The effectiveness of a conference is likely to turn upon the intensity of the participants' engagement more than upon any other single factor. The participants should, therefore, share an understanding of what the conference is trying to do and how the parts are designed toward that end. There should be, not just descriptions of what is going to take place, but also explanations of why, and not just at the beginning of a conference, but also serially. This advice would be platitudinous if it were not often neglected—neglected, moreover, because often no clear objectives have been defined.

Amendment: The participants should share an understanding of *part* of what the conference is trying to do. An educator—particularly a university educator—should have goals in addition to those that the participants seek to achieve. These additional or farther goals should, of course, be consistent with the participants' goals. But usually it is better to try to achieve these other goals first and then talk about them, if at all.

A precise statement of objectives is to a conference what a precise statement of the problem is to systems analysis and planning; without it there will be, at worst, neither a solution nor a failure from which one can learn, and, at best, a solution from which one can learn nothing. This brings us to evaluation.

I have nothing new to say about evaluation and would let it go at that, except that I want to appreciate its importance. When I was with The Fund for Adult Education, I heard the ablest exponents of one extreme, that education is intangible and attempts to evaluate it are like an orangutan playing with a violin; and of the other extreme, that anything making a difference can be detected in some way, even if only indirectly, as charged particles reveal their paths in a cloud chamber. I saw projects that could not be evaluated because nobody knew what he was trying to do; I saw projects whose evaluation apparatus on the educational activities looked like the gadgets on a teenager's jalopy. My evaluations of my own projects were always modest, commonsensical, subjective—and unsatisfactory. All I, who am not research-minded, have to say is that it is important to do the best evaluating you can do and this best requires a clear conception of objectives and also an incorporation of the evaluation design into the planning and conduct of the conference. Perhaps the main virtue of evaluation is not that it tells you afterwards what you have done but that it disciplines you to define beforehead what you are trying to do.

* * *

I turn now to the "Who?" of conferences.

The best conferences are made up of people who have enough in common to discourse together and enough differences to make the discourse cross-fertilizing. *Intent* is pivotal. A participant whose intent is something other than educational—whether to oppose, to promote, to "sell," to grind some ax or other—that person is dangerous to a conference. The more he has in common with the other participants in other ways and the greater his communicative skills are, the more dangerous he is. A person who has the intent to engage in mutual learning and who brings differences that force the examination of easy agreements—that person is an asset to a conference. Few experiences are more educational than taking part in international meetings where one has continually to correct the provinciality of his premises. This benefit should be deliberately planned for in local, state and national conferences also. Few educational results are more needed than to stretch, however slightly, the capacity of all of us "to agree to disagree agreeably."

A conference planner must, of course, be concerned with the right "mix" of kinds and degrees of differences, and the proper recipe depends upon many things, including the length of the conference. But the easy and "safe" way to conduct a conference is to float with the tide of "consensus," never mind that it be mindless, so long as the voyage toward disaster be placid, unruffled by the nasty winds of "controversy"—"a painted ship upon a painted ocean," bearing "plastic people sniffing plastic roses."

A university may have little or nothing to say about who takes part in some conferences. It would be instructive for university conference managers to make an accounting of the number of conferences in which they have at least an equal voice in defining the objectives and the participants. The lower the score, the higher should be the managers' concern.

Here I refer again to the Center's survey, from which I quoted: "Adult education . . . provides many opportunities for the well-to-do but it involves only peripherally the workers, the poor, and the unemployed." The point rams squarely against the problem of money and, if we press it hard enough, it pierces to the deeper question of values: How important does a university consider its adult education role? And what does it consider that role to be—whether public relations or the continuing education of self-governing citizens. This subject is too intimate, I know, for profitable general discussion, but one of its aspects merits open discussion and brings us to the next factor of conferences, "Where?"

In my judgment the building of large, elaborate, expensive centers for continuing education has harmed the development of university conferences. I have no opinion about whether the benefits outweigh the harm; in any event, we do not know what might have been if foundations and universities had co-operated in demonstrating what could be done with modest, low-cost facilities. But the harm is palpable. It should be recognized. It should be placed against the background of the economics of continuing education; the economics of the participants (or nonparticipants) for a change.

In this complex background I point to two contrasts: first, the contrast between the individual who is well-heeled or on an expense account and the individual who is not; second, the contrast between the organization that is well-financed and the organization that is not.

To the Carnegie Foundation's Annual Report for 1966 Acting President Alan Pifer wrote a disturbing introduction, "The Nongovernmental Organization at Bay."

". . . the social value of nongovernmental organizations continues to mount in response to the steadily broadening aspirations of our society and to the nation's expanding international commitments. Indeed, the financial uncertainty of these organizations in the face of growing responsibilities and sharply increased costs threatens to limit their future usefulness and undermine the private aide of a public-private partnership through which the nation is now accomplishing some of its most public business. . . .

". . . the real issue is beginning to emerge clearly. Is the nongovernmental organization of the future to be simply an auxiliary to the state, a kind of willing but not very resourceful handmaiden? Or is it to be a strong, independent adjunct that provides government with a type of capability it cannot provide for itself?"

Waldemar A. Nielson, the president of one of these "nongovernmental organizations at bay," the African-American Institute, also struck the tocsin, in the New York Times for March 18, 1967:

"There is one vital category of institutions . . . which is being pinched excruciatingly by rising demands for services on the one hand and lack of financial resources on the other. This is that amorphous group of private agencies which are neither schools nor churches nor hospitals nor museums and which are loosely called 'nongovernmental organizations.' They range from the United Nations Association and the N.A.A.C.P. on the one hand to local civic groups and community centers on the other. . . .

"An important and even vital segment of the institutional structure of our society is financially orphaned—and important tasks in the areas of public education, social welfare and international relations are not being carried out as well as they must be."

The nongovernmental organization either deals with or is made up of the kinds of people whom the Center's survey revealed to be only "peripherally" involved in adult education. It deals with "education for civic and social competence," which the Center survey revealed to be "almost completely lacking" in American adult education. It is, indeed, a very expression of civic and social competence.

Now, against this background I ask you to project the Demonstration Center for Continuing Education. It is like viewing Taj Mahal against the poverty of India—and is just about as accessible for conferences by people who don't have such money or who are not on expense accounts, and by the orphaned nongovernmental organizations.

Therefore, I say that American universities need to turn their concern for conference facilities that more people and organizations can afford and that give universities more freedom in defining the "Whys?" and "Whos?" of conferences,. I say this to those conference directors who have the mixed blessing of being possessed by Hilton-Taj Mahals and to those conference directors who have the mixed blessing of not possessing Hilton-Taj Mahals.

* * *

To open the subject of *How* to conduct a conference, I borrow a story from Woodrow Wilson. One night an impatient passenger was standing on the bridge of a steamboat plying between New Orleans and St. Louis. Fog lay bridge-deep upon the Mississippi. The captain ordered that the boat be tied up to a tree. The passenger demanded, "Why are we stopping?" The captain answered, "Because of the fog." The passenger objected, "I can see the North Star." The captain said, "We aren't going there."

The *hows* of a conference are as essential to its effectiveness as its objectives are. I will comment laconically on a few of the landmarks that I have discerned in the fog of planning and running conferences.

Get the participants to prepare for the conference by reading specially prepared or carefully selected material, or by listening to comparable tapes, or by seeing appropriate films or television programs.

Simplify the program. It grows cluttered from the conception to the final arrangement. The last step in planning should be a ruthless pruning.

Make your time-schedule realistic; then hold to it.

Make room and leave room for the participants to get to know and enjoy each other informally.

Build your conference on the members' participation. If there is not much point in the members' participating actively, there probably isn't much point in holding the conference.

Pick your discussion leaders with greater care than you pick your speakers; bring them together for orientation before the conference and occasionally during the conference, if it is longer than a day.

Surround the participants with beauty and excitement—exhibits, displays, paintings, pieces of sculpture, models and the like.

Set up a large library of good paperback books; encourage the participants to steal them.

(In the course of a learned lecture to a conference of high government officials, I once commented aside that their conference library had no books that could be read for pleasure. The first question was, "What do you mean—'reading for pleasure'?" After I had answered, an official commented sadly, "I haven't read that way for 30 years.")

Pay careful attention to the subtle, emotional developments during a conference. If it successfully engages the participants, strange and dangerous moods may develop. If the conference is more than a few days long, expect slumps, doldrums, even crises, and be ready with rests and changes of pace.

Follow through on a conference. The follow-through is probably the conference's most neglected aspect—one where conference executives have much to learn from business sales executives. Keep in touch with at least some of the participants. Send them materials and information.

Or is there, perhaps, in the new technology of communications, better ways of keeping in touch?

With this question I end my staccato comments on the housekeeping of conferences and raise a point of a different order.

* * *

H. G. Wells once wrote, "The cardinal fact in history during the past 50 centuries has been the scope, pace and precision of intercommunications. Everything else is subordinate to that." We can refine Wells' statement: The cardinal fact during the past 50 years, the past 50 months, the past 50 weeks, perhaps even the past 50 days, has been the scope, pace and precision of intercommunications. Everything else is subordinate to that because intercommunications are the regulating factor of human life. They regulate every turn in the spiral of knowledge and power—the dissemination of old and the search for new knowledge; the analysis and statement of problems; the conception and designing and testing of proposed solutions; the feedback and evaluation of results; the decision to execute; the control of power—intercommunications regulate every turn in the opening and accelerating spiral of knowledge and power. That is, they regulate every turn insofar as it is regulated; the spiral itself is getting out of hand.

Education is the intercommunication that should be the regulator of the regulators—the NA of the RNA. In this context I recall my statement that educators have much more to learn than they seem to have learned from the way of thinking that is called "systems analysis and planning." To it I now add, educators have much more to learn than they have about the potentialities of the new and ever newer technology of intercommunications, and adult educators have the most to learn of all. One of the findings of the Center survey was: "Adult education is far behind the elementary and secondary schools and the colleges in the use of new educational technology—despite the fact that recent developments in information storage and retrieval and the use of mass-media for educational purposes could be especially applicable to and useful in adult education."

As Cicero would say, I do not need to cite to you such developments as the stationary communications satellite, the Ford Foundation's proposal for educational broadcasting, the Carnegie Commission's recommendations for public broadcasting and President Johnson's message to Congress, which embraced radio as well as television. It is fortunate that I do not need to cite such developments because they would include developments in telephony, computers and computer systems, teaching machines and other programmed learning, quick and cheap reproductions, facsimile transmission, the fantastic world of coherent light and a list of other present and onrushing capabilities too long for our time.

On a modest scale, you should ask how some of these capabilities can be used in the preparation of participants for conferences, in the conduct of conferences and in the follow-through of conferences.

But such capabilities should make you ask also a more basic question (here I pick up another thread I left dangling); that is, *whether* to hold a conference. With such intercommunications as are already available and with others greater in every respect already visibly rushing at us down the road—are not many (not to say most) conferences unnecessary? Are not old-style conferences like buggies in Detroit (not to say, like oxcarts at Point Kennedy)? Can we bring together the minds without moving the bodies?

You should ask this question. Insofar as the answer is "yes," vistas open of new types of "short-term learning" (and "long-term learning" too) that I decided not to treat in this paper but that could have been my starting point.

Insofar as the answer is, "No—there is still a place for the actual physical presence of people in conferences," then the question is, What is the place? What, for our present purpose, is the place of university conferences for adults? This leads to the final element of conferences—the "What?"

* * *

I introduce this section with another story, a true one. At the conclusion of a conference of labor leaders at a Big Ten university, the union education director and I observed that most of the participants were wearing university sweatshirts. The union educator remarked wryly, "Well, at least they are taking away that much of the university."

Thomas De Quincy distinguished three classes of literature—the literature of *entertainment*, whose function is to amuse; the literature of *knowledge*, whose function is to teach; the literature of *power*, whose function is to move. Applying these distinctions to university conferences, I pass the following curt judgments:

A university's business is not entertainment. It should, of course, seek to be interesting and lively; it should pay sensitive attention, I have suggested, to the play of emotions and mood. But the American society does not need another institution of entertainment.

Insofar as the purpose of short-term learning is knowledge—defined as factual information addressed to the mind as an isolated faculty, learnings that are certain to perish soon by the simple process of obsolescence—to this extent there are better agencies than a university and better methods than a conference.

The business of a university is to *move* with intellectual and imaginative power.

A university should be detached only about the little issues. In the large issues it should be passionately committed. Its members should care and its goal should be to move others to care.

What are the big issues? To wrestle with this question is what education is all about—I would even say, what human life is all about: to define what is important and to pursue it.

Of course every person needs some specialized knowledge and skill and needs to keep these as current as possible. But importance belongs to the one life of the one individual, whose specialized knowledge should be only a part of his larger knowledge and whose intellectual faculties should be only a part of his larger sentience.

Of course the nation needs specialized "manpower" (note the dehumanizing phrase). But if there is a special importance in the American society—as I believe there to be—it is because the values and goals of the American society have meaning for every person on Earth, for the entire human race.

A university's business is knowledge—but it should always lead out to the seamless universe of which it is a living part. It should always suggest the more fundamental meanings it presupposes.

A university's business is to teach—but the most important, and the only enduring, capacity it can develop is the ability to criticize values and goals.

A university's business is service—but what service is higher than to help self-governing citizens to cope with a future of which all we know for certain is that it will be different from the present? What service is more needed—needed more desperately as specialization advances? And what agency will perform this service, if not the university?

I have, I fear, said both too much and not enough—too much for those who understand me and not enough for those who do not. A vision of the university's passionate role calls for either a tone or a poem.

In his preface to *Alastor*. Shelley wrote, "They who, deluded by no generous error, instigated by no sacred thirst of doubtful knowledge, duped by no illustrious superstitions, loving nothing on this earth and cherishing no hopes beyond, yet keep aloof from sympathies with their own kind, rejoicing neither in human joy nor mourning, with human grief; these . . . languish because none feel with them their common nature."

We need must be deluded; let our errors be generous.
We need must be duped; let our superstitions be illustrious.
Let us give full rein to our feelings of common nature.
Let us search for communities—and invite others to the quest.

PRESENTATION TO THE CORRESPONDENCE STUDY DIVISION

SATURDAY, APRIL 22

INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA — OLD, NEW, AND OTHERWISE

Ohmer Milton
Director, Learning Resources Center
The University of Tennessee

Since one instructional medium—the human voice—has been the preferred one throughout the history of higher education and continues to be today, it may be appropriate to focus first upon the "Old" and the "Otherwise." That is, the validity and utility of many of our undergraduate teaching approaches need to be examined here in the latter part of the twentieth century.

Whereas certain of the new instructional media have potentialities for revolutionizing higher education in the sense of enabling our institutions to be increasingly effective in attaining or fulfilling diverse purposes and goals, such may not be the case unless traditional patterns and approaches are first winnowed, sifted, and applied in a much more discriminating manner than seems to be the case at the moment. Thus, a brief look at the current "state of the establishment" may be helpful in providing perspective about effective utilization of the "New."

Sine Qua Non

During the time of Socrates and for many years thereafter, it was absolutely necessary for a student and teacher to be in the same place at the same time. The human voice and *nearby* ears were the *only* means of communication. All of the elements of good teaching (whatever they may be) had to transpire in a face-to-face setting. Throughout the intervening centuries, several devices have been created which tend to decrease the *necessity* of this personal contact in order for knowledge to be transmitted and learning to occur. *Books* were the first of these instruments; in recent years many others have been developed—telephone, film, radio, television, and now computers.

Even though most of these devices are plentiful, in some instances inexpensive, and to be found on most campuses, one gets the impression at times that their utilization is unduly limited with the vast majority of students. It seems that the face-to-face setting, originally a necessity but no longer so, has continued to be the *sine qua non* for instruction.

As support for this assertion, both observation and some research suggest that the two principal parties in the college classroom today perceive the roles of the professor to be almost entirely those of: (a) a dispenser of knowledge, (b) an explainer of the textbook, and (c) a source of some magic force. Moreover, there seems to be rather frequent affirmation or reenforcement of these perceptions and expectations.

One indication of the perpetuation of these beliefs about professors is the current panacea for undergraduate instruction being proposed in many publications and being uttered by many faculty members—small classes. A basic proposition seems to be that the nearer the student-teacher ratio approaches one-to-one, the better is the teaching-learning; that is, the better the three features of the role can be fulfilled. This proposition, of course, reflects the belief in the *necessity* of personal contact between student and teacher. Somehow a mysterious or magic force operates as a result of the face-to-face association; if the force is absent, there can be *no* learning (witness the frequent *requirement* that students attend class).

In this connection, it was most enlightening to me to note the *origin* of the small class notion. Alvin C. Eurich, formerly of the Ford Foundation and now of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, in an address to the Association for Higher Education in 1956, reported:

> Historically, where did we get our fixed notion of one teacher for every 25 students? I have searched long. With a clue from a casual conversation and with the aid of an eminent Talmudic scholar, President Samuel Belkin of Yeshiva University, I now find the answer goes back to at least the middle of the third century. In Babylonian Talmud Baba Bathra 21A the rule was established by Rabbi Raba, an authoritative sage of his era: "25 students are to be enrolled in one class. If there are from 25 to 40, an assistant must be obtained. Above 40, two teachers are to be engaged."[1]

(I doubt very much if the sage was referring to college classes.)

Much of the current recruiting propaganda also reenforces the perceptions and expectations about professorial roles. One *large* school, for example, via slick paper brochure, beams to high school seniors:

> Each faculty member has been selected not only on the basis of his scholarly attainment but also because of his active interest in the educational development and the day to day problems of young people.

Lecturing

Other evidence that indicates continuation of the traditional roles comes from the recent investigation by Richard Evans[2] of the University of Houston of an entire faculty of 400 (the fact that faculty members were studied is quite an oddity). He found that 85 per cent of them believed they were "good" teachers, and that *lecturing* was, without question, the most frequently utilized and preferred approach in instruction.

One interpretation of this emphasis upon lecturing today is that there still exists a reluctance to admit the value of *books* for student learning. Frederich Rudolph[3] documented the fact that during the early days of colleges in the United States, faculties were hesitant in beginning to place books in the hands of students. Student literary societies, on the other hand, welcomed books on campuses and hastened to make a place for them in the educational enterprise.

Conditioned Students

Judging by certain student reactions, we must have conditioned them to believe in the necessity of the traditional professorial roles if they are to learn or achieve. In one study with seniors at The University of Tennessee in which a course had been taught by six or seven specialists—to stimulate enthusiasm and interest—the students were most upset, because during a post-course evaluation their main question was, "But who was our teacher?" And these were graduating seniors, age twenty-two. Furthermore, many surveys have shown that students tend to dislike all teaching approaches other than the "conventional."

Two personal experiences further illustrate student beliefs about what professors must do in the classroom in order for them to learn. At the end of one of my courses in which there had been no lecturing, a student responded on a questionnaire: "I cannot rate Dr. Milton as a teacher for I have never *heard* him teach." On another occasion as I was announcing on the first day of class that there would be no lecturing throughout the course, a coed asked in a distressed tone: "But, Sir, who is going to explain the textbook to us?"

Research

Fortunately for our purposes, as we attempt to wrestle with understanding instructional media, research data are available for guidance—these can be used instead of hunch, dogma, or tradition. During the past ten or fifteen years, the research eye has been turned upon many features of teaching-learning—especially some of those which have been particularly cherished. As many of you know, large numbers of studies in almost all subject matter fields comparing achievement in large classes versus small ones, under lecturing versus discussion, with television versus live presentations, in the context of programmed learning versus conventional methods, and others, have revealed almost without exception, no significant differences; that is, students achieve as well under one arrangement as another. Although there have been only a very few studies of the development of such abilities as "critical thinking" and "learning resourcefulness"—two widely proclaimed products of a college education—findings are similar—no significant differences as the result of various teaching approaches.

Elaboration of two of these studies may serve to highlight my central theme—the need for penetrating questions about the role of faculty members as institutions of higher education attempt to fulfill their increasingly complex functions in society. We cannot lose sight of the fact either that varied and complex sorts of learning—the simple to the complex, the concrete to the abstract, the mundane to the ethereal—are expected of students.

In one of our efforts at The University of Tennessee,[4] a large group of students, following two weeks of orientation, *did not attend class* for the remainder of the term. They performed on content tests as well as or slightly better than did a control group that attended class on the typical thrice per week basis. Incidentally, the "class" group received the best instruction ever! None of my psychology classes before or since, especially since, has been the recipient of such planning, preparation, execution, and solicitude. The "no-class" group also exhibited more effort than did the "class" one as measured by workbook purchases and completing supplementary readings. Two years later, an examination of the transcripts of all students indicated the dropout rates from the university were essentially the same for the two groups, and approximately the same percentages had taken advanced courses in psychology.

The other investigation was conducted at the University of Colorado.[5] Certain significant differences in achievement *were* found when a Physical Optics course was taught in a *non*-conventional fashion.

Registered students were divided into two groups at the beginning of the first semester. Twenty-eight of them heard three lectures each week, received assignments to be completed outside of class, were asked questions in class, and took two one-hour tests during the semester—a conventional course or teaching approach in every respect.

The other group of twenty-two students *did not attend class* after orientation during the first week. They were given a set of five major topics which were to be covered in the course; the topics were not identical with chapter headings in the text—thus students were forced to *search* for appropriate material. Study groups were formed of four or five students each.

The final examination was designed to test performance at four points along a continuum of complexity of thought. About half of the fifty students continued in the course—taught in the conventional fashion—the second semester. Near the middle of the second term a surprise exam was given, parts of which corresponded to certain parts of the final for the first semester. The table shows the specific objectives of the first semester finals, the corresponding parts of it administered during the second semester, and the reults:

Nature of Exam Questions	First Semester Final Exam	Surprise Exam Next Semester
Simple facts and ideas on Optics	*Class best*	*Class best*
Applications of simple facts and ideas to solve somewhat simple problems	*Class best*	Not measured
More difficult applications	*No-class best*	Not measured
Exposure to entirely new material, then questioned	*No-class best*	*No-class best*

GPA's

For some strange reason, one essential feature of professorial activity seems to have been overlooked or disregarded by many who have sought to understand teaching-learning—testing and grading or evaluation of student performance. On the basis of some recent and disturbing research, however, this is another aspect of the "state of the establishment" that requires careful scrutiny. More powerful influences may be operating upon student behavior than are realized.

It has been *assumed* throughout the years that grades and grade-point-averages reflect not only academic accomplishment but that they also serve as good indicators of future non-academic attainments; consequently, they continue to be used as a major basis for many important decisions about students—honors, financial aid, campus leadership positions, job choices, graduate school entry, and others. (Students seem to be especially attuned to these uses of grades.)

Yet during the past few years, revealing and sobering studies have shown: a) extreme variations in grading practices within and among faculties in various institutions, b) tenuous and highly suspect relationships between grades and non-academic endeavors, c) the fact that percentages of unsatisfactory grades have remained constant or even increased as ability levels of student bodies show an upward trend, and d) many untoward impacts of evaluation upon students.

Brief mention of only two investigations may provide some substantiating evidence for these assertions. Davis[6] of the National Opinion Research Center surveyed 1,673 seniors from 135 colleges and universities; all had been National Merit Scholarship holders, finalists, or semi-finalists. Seventy per cent of these students of outstanding academic aptitude had received top grades in the lowest quality schools; only 36 per cent of them received comparable grades in the highest quality ones. Many of these superior young people with *less than a B+ average* in the high-ranking schools chose *not* to pursue graduate study; they underestimated their academic abilities. Their self-esteem and their aspirations were lowered because the faculties had judged them solely on the basis of personal and local standards.

At the same time, the American College Testing Program[7] has shown in the little booklet, "College Student Profiles," on the basis of a survey of 400 institutions, that students in each one of them tend to receive the same percentages of A's, B's, and so on, in spite of the academic potentials of student bodies. Some of the schools are highly selective, while others have open admission policies.

Winnowing and Sifting

Thus, consideration of instructional media must be done within the context of the "state of the establishment"—a state that has certainly existed for a century or more. At least two inescapable facts or intractable realities must be added to the hopper of concern: 1) enrollments are approaching ten million and 2) there are shortages of faculty members in many fields.

In the final analysis, faculty members must resolve all of these issues and problems—as well as many others—in instruction. They have been and must continue to be in direct control of teaching-learning arrangements. Their thoughtful and rational alterations of the "Old" and the "Otherwise" might be of immeasurable assistance to both undergraduates and society.

Toward the ends of alterations, the following sorts of questions[8] seem pertinent and relevant:

(1) In view of the availability of a vast array of devices for dispensing information—television, programmed materials, tape recorders, and inexpensive and widely available *books*—what is the most educationally appropriate and distinctive future role of the professor in the college classroom?

(2) What are some of our practices which should be altered so as to place greater responsibility upon the student for his own learning?

(3) Should the role of the faculty continue to be essentially the same in both freshman and senior courses?

(4) What is the evidence to support our claims that students gain, for example, in ability to think critically and to respect honest differences of opinion? What contributions do we really make in the development of these characteristics?

(5) In view of the increasing heterogeneity of student bodies in such characteristics as abilities and interests, in what ways should arrangements be altered so as to take into account this expanded range of individual differences?

(6) Are certain teaching arrangements (e.g., the fifty-minute hour) in one field (for example, mathematics) necessarily appropriate for other fields (for example, history)?

(7) Should all classes in all subject matter areas meet the same number of times per week?

(8) In what ways can the total campus environment be altered so that its peculiar forces can be useful in promoting learning?

(9) To what extent should students participate in important decision making about the academic affairs of colleges and universities?

(10) Given the desirability of such broad goals as this one typical of those in many college catalogues:

> A liberal arts education seeks to create for the individual a basis for mature private life and intelligent participation in society. . . .,

what do we specifically mean by them, and how effective are we in achieving them?

Television

Although I am unable to say with any degree of certainty, television is probably being used primarily to facilitate *lecturing*. It is my impression, using what is happening at my own institution as a guide, that classes taught via television meet in much the same fashion as do non-TV ones—for the purpose of *talking to* large numbers of students. The "Old" is continuing to operate. If this be the case on a grand scale, then a potentially valuable aid is being misused.

Computer-Assisted Instruction and Programmed* Instruction[9]

Computer-Assisted Instruction (CAI) and its immediate predecessor, Programmed Instruction (P.I.) are the only media which are based upon principles of learning as developed by psychologists. Although CAI is in its infancy, it appears to have more advantages and fewer disadvantages than any of the other devices.

---

* Great scholarly debates have raged over the spelling of this word — "m" or "mm." Someone even programmed or programed the essence of the erudition.

Whereas some of the principles of P.I. had their origins as early as the 1920's, programmed materials were not considered for extensive use in classrooms until around 1957. Segments of the American public and many educators responded to the Russian Sputnik of that year by seeking panaceas for whatever ailed our educational system. Many of the pronouncements of B. F. Skinner of Harvard University were seized upon as ready-made solutions. As the results of his work with white rats and pigeons over a period of at least 20 years, Skinner insisted that there were several basic features of the learning process: 1) the learner must be active rather than passive—the adage of "learning by doing," 2) it is necessary for material to be presented logically in a series of small steps, 3) provisions must be made for students to learn at their own pace, and 4) learning is strengthened or reenforced when there is *immediate* knowledge of results.[19]

Initially, these principles were incorporated into material to be learned and the resulting "program" was presented to the student via a very simple "teaching machine." It was found after a short period of time that an actual "machine" was not needed and that subject matter could be presented in the form of a "programmed* textbook." Extensive research with P.I. at the college level has revealed: 1) students learn equally well—as measured by the usual classroom techniques—via this approach as via conventional ones, 2) students tend to be bored with programmed materials—the boredom factor within the lecture system has not been investigated systematically or extensively, 3) it is not necessary for all subject matter to be presented in small steps, and 4) it is impossible to present subject matter in such a fashion as to take into account all of the vicissitudes of either students or of the material—inflexibility is a decided impediment.

Furthermore, it became clear that college students do not possess certain of the characteristics of white rats and pigeons. When animals learn in the laboratory, they are *deprived*—they are extremely hungry and consequently *motivated* to work or learn in exchange for food pellets; they seek to reduce their deprivation. Many college students, on the other hand, are not only deprived, but they resist vigorously being deprived of their own ignorance. (P.I. should not be condemned for this shortcoming since motivation remains an unmanaged element in other teaching approaches.)

The utilization of computers enables considerable reduction of the major limitations of the earlier knowledge transmission devices. The most important features of CAI are those of *flexibility* and *adaptability*. That is to say, 1) material can be presented in several forms—words, pictures, and sound; students can respond in a variety of ways—type on an electric typewriter, write with a "light" pen, and speak, 2) a given lesson can be presented in different ways to different students—depending upon their ability, prior knowledge, and preparation, and 3) rich complex subject matter can be presented so as to require complex reactions or responses by students—the formation of concepts, for example.

CAI, at the moment, is primarily a powerful research tool by which variables in the teaching-learning process can be isolated for investigation. There are several issues and questions which require resolution:

(1) There is a shortage of persons who can write effective programs.

(2) Computers cannot deal with all the varied student responses.

(3) The autonomy of schools makes it difficult to transfer programs from school to school without rewriting them.

(4) How far a student has progressed in a task does not always correlate with how well the materials have been learned.

(5) Little is known about the extent to which students transfer what is learned via CAI to other situations.

(6) The measurement of achievement or learning continues to be a plaguing matter. It will be recognized, of course, that most of the above issues are not unique to CAI—they are basic ones in all instructional approaches.

> We put helpless old people in hospitals.
> We put helpless young people in college.
>
> —Frost

References

1. Eurich, A. D. "Better Instruction with Fewer Teachers," in G. K. Smith, ed., *Current Issues in Higher Education, 1956: The Proceedings of the 11th Annual National Conference on Higher Education*. Washington: Association for Higher Education, 1956, pp. 10–16.
2. Evans, R. I., *et al. The University Faculty and Educational Television: Hostility, Resistance, & Change*. United States Department of Education. Houston: University of Houston, 1962.
3. Rudolph, F. "Changing Patterns of Authority and Influence," in A. Knorr and W. J. Minter, eds., *Order and Freedom on the Campus*. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1965, p. 5.
4. Milton, O. "Two-Year Follow-Up: Objective Data After Learning Without Class Attendance," *Psychological Reports*, XI (1962). Pp. 833-836.
5. Gruber, H. E. and M. Weitman. *Self-Directed Study: Experiments in Higher Education*. University of Colorado Behavior Research Laboratory Report No. 19. Boulder, Colorado: University of Colorado, April, 1962.
6. Davis, J. A. *Great Aspirations*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1964.
7. ACT Research and Development Division. *College Student Profiles: Norms for the Act Assessment*. 1966-67 Edition. Iowa City, Iowa: The American College Testing Program, 1967.
8. Milton, O. and E. J. Shoben, Jr. (eds.). *Learning and the Professors*. Washington: American Council on Education (in press).
9. Standing Council on the Improvement of Teaching and Learning. *Teaching-Learning Issues*, No. 3, Winter, 1967. Knoxville, Tennessee: Learning Resources, The University of Tennessee.
10. Milton, O. and L. J. West. *P.I.: What It Is and How It Works*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, Inc., 1961.

OPENING GENERAL SESSION

SUNDAY, APRIL 23

ONE FOUNDATION'S CONCEPT OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

Robert E. Kinsinger
Director, Division of Education and Public Affairs
W. K. Kellogg Foundation

Thomas Jefferson once wrote to DuPont de Nemours: "Society will never reach a state of perfection. However, mankind can achieve great improvement, and the diffusion of knowledge among the people is the instrument by which it can be effected."

Your participation in the National University Extension Association attests your belief in the soundness of Mr. Jefferson's pronouncement, for the NUEA exemplifies a concern for knowledge communication as implemented by cooperative relations between the nation's universities.

Man is both competitive and cooperative, and the social organizations he has created share in this paradox. Institutions of higher education have grown above viewing rival colleges and universities as "the enemy." Healthily, competition does continue—for endowments; for recruitment of outstanding scholars for student body and faculty; for government research grants; for prestige, publicity, and popularity (rumor hath it that there is even some jousting to enroll promising athletes)—but, even so, cooperative relationships are definitely the order of the day in efforts to research, communicate, and apply knowledge for the benefit of the people.

And gone forever, it is hoped, is the pathological aura in which the Mohammedans burned the great libraries at Alexandria because QUOTE "the Koran contains all the truth." A more recent, but equally fortunate disappearance is that of the fundamentalist whose position not too many years ago equated to "It's a crime to know more than I know." Now there is almost universal appreciation of the fact that only the best thinking and action will cope with the exigencies of tomorrow, and democracies and totalitarian states alike realize that the nation which most wisely marshals its total educational resources to develop the intelligence of its people will be preeminent economically, scientifically, militarily, and culturally in the years ahead.

When the W. K. Kellogg Foundation was just a year-old infant—back in 1931—it precociously realized that "Education offers the greatest opportunity for really improving one generation over another." And my Foundation predecessors early embraced the concept that learning is a lifelong process, and proceeded to support this premise through its aid to a ten-year, $8 million program known as the Michigan Community Health Project. While this project in seven counties of southwestern Michigan involved subsidies for facilities (such as for the establishment of county health departments), personnel, and for consultants in broad areas of health, education, and recreation, an important realization in "bringing these counties up-to-date" was that community leaders must have access to training opportunities through *continuing education*. The term "continuing education"—little c, little e—was actually used for these pioneering efforts which permitted physicians, dentists, nurses, school superintendents and teachers, school boards, church pastors, the dairyman, the veterinarian, to take short courses at various universities and colleges. (Parenthetically, I do not know of any earlier use of the words "continuing education" to indicate education for the adult continuing through his life.)

In the years that have followed, and particularly in the period just following World War II when many health professionals re-entered civilian life and needed refresher training therefor, the Foundation has used program grants plus scholarships and fellowships to aid in the United States the professions of agriculture, dentistry, education, hospitals, medicine, public health, and nursing to develop inservice education. In somewhat lesser degree, institutions in Canada, Western Europe, and Latin America were aided in similar endeavors. And it should be pointed out that while the bulk of the grants were for on-the-job or short course education for professionals, other occupational levels were not forgotten. For instance, the American Hospital Association's Partnership for Progress is a nationwide continuing education program which is using $1¼ million of the Kellogg Foundation's money to refresh and update hospital workers in all echelons.

Although my remarks today will be primarily concerned with continuing education in university facilities tailored to expedite a program, our support for continuing education has been much broader than for programs at residential centers alone. For instance, only a few miles from here at Oakland University are two Foundation-aided programs which represent additional thrusts in charting the possible future of continuing education. An "alumni" program is geared to the proposition that the university's graduates will never cease to be students, that the undergraduate must have this concept presented to him regularly from the day he arrives on campus, and that there should be provided for alumni thus sensitized, correspondence courses, weekend workshops, and formal, advanced educational programs offering a wide variety of learning opportunities witnessing to the belief that "Education is a lifelong process." It is gratifying to note that, due in considerable part to the impetus of this program, the American Alumni Council will on Tuesday at this conference ask the National University Extension Association to cooperate with it in extending opportunities for systematic continuing education to the 22 million alumni of our nation's colleges and universities.

Another singular Oakland program is its "Continuum for Women." (Parenthetically, I should lament that the *Battle Creek Enquirer and News* carried a story about this program under the headline—FOUNDATION TO HELP WOMEN FULFILL THEMSELVES.) Nevertheless, the program is evolving to help women discover and exploit their optimum roles in society beyond the traditional homemaking and childrearing. When women return to the work-world, or the professions, or the world of the auxiliary volunteer after rearing their children, they will, via the continuum, have been given marketable skills, professional education, motivation, and assistance with appropriate placement so that their talents and potential will not be wasted or limited by educational barriers.

That continuing education is not for urban residents alone is indicated by Michigan State University's two-year-old Farmers' Study Program to develop leaders for farm communities. Using Foundation funds the College of Agriculture conducts for selected young farmers study institutes and travel seminars which convey understandings of the social, economic, and political framework in which modern agriculture functions as an integral part of an industrial society. Covered is not agriculture *per se*, but topics such as "The Changing Rural Society"; "Operation of Political Parties and Interest Groups"; "Discussions on Values and Beliefs"; and even one session concerning "The Dance and Its Relationship to Society."

Time precludes my discussion in any detail of other nonresidential continuing education programs aided by the Foundation, but their function will be indicated by the titles of just a few of them—"The Salzburg Seminar to Improve European-American Relationships"; the "W. K. Kellogg Foundation Institute of Graduate and Postgraduate Dentistry"; the "American College of Hospital Administration"; "Employee Education for the National Health Council"; Nursing Programs of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education; and Regional Agricultural Education provided by the Southern Regional Education Board.

The most visible support of the Foundation has been related to the concept, first put into action at the Kellogg Center at Michigan State University in 1951, of an educational center able to offer periodical learning experiences to a broad spectrum of adult society within a university environment and featuring a specially designed facility for this purpose. The emphasis has been on the educational program within the context of a great university having vast intellectual resources and services. Support for the center facilities has grown out of the need for a short term in-resident educational complex tailored to the program objectives, and the resources of the university.

Continuing education became *Continuing Education*—capital "C" and capital "E"—through the Foundation-aided establishment of the Kellogg Center at East Lansing. The use of the capital letters was intended to alert the public to a new road to learning for adults. Kellogg Center, as well as the eight other residential centers subsidized in part by the Foundation, seeks to present optimum conditions for adults to "go back to school" in great numbers. For brief periods they are able to consider with experts pertinent topics vital to their jobs, their families, and their communities . . . the encouragement of adult learning after the end of formal education and, in fact, throughout life.

To encourage university-oriented adult learning, the Foundation from 1951 to date has made grants totaling more than $16 million to aid the establishment of nine residential centers for continuing education, each planned to demonstrate a unique feature. These, in the order of their founding, are at Michigan State University; the University of Georgia, with an emphasis on new communications media; the University of Nebraska, incorporating a specialized Hall of Youth; the University of Oklahoma, with decentralized facilities; the University of Chicago, the first private institution focused on continuing education for national leaders; the University of Notre Dame, concerned with philosophical questions of man and society; Oxford University in England, providing leadership in British adult education; the New England Center for Continuing Education, now being developed at the University of New Hampshire, which is based on a consortium of six state universities; and the evolving Center for International Affairs at Columbia University, with a broad perspective for the international scholar.

Following the establishment of the first two of these centers, we have had scores of proposals to aid further expansion of the residential learning idea. Those proposals to the Foundation which found eventual acceptance were, to a considerable degree, evaluated under what we, in our philanthropoid jargon, call "The Fifteen Criteria." These, hurriedly, are: Uniqueness of proposed program; Specificity of planning; Extent and Quality of involvement of staff in the planning; Evaluation procedures included in the plan; Training programs for professional adult education leaders included in the plan; Recognition of the necessity of pre- and post-conference experiences; Facility space planning; Experience in conducting continuing education activities; Ability of the leadership designated for the program; Desirability and cost of site or sites; Stability of central administration of the institution; Opportunity for contribution to local community's standard of living; and Analysis of the financing necessary to construct, program, and maintain the center.

While the nine centers have dissimilarities, several by design, they also have several common characteristics including:

(1) The education is CONTINUING, i.e., a SERIES of conferences, seminars, or workshops, with other educational experiences between meetings. Ideally, groups with a common interest meet year after year. (Last year, 67% of the conferences in one of the Centers were "repeat" ones.) Involved are preconference planning, and pre- and postconference contact through supplemental literature and sometimes television and radio. This planning is the joint work of center staff people and leaders of the agency sponsoring the conference.

(2) The meetings are held in a university setting, offering people retreat from their usual environment and largely precluding the interruptions which occur in everyday routines. Ordinarily for two, three, four, or more days, the meetings see the participants devoting FULL TIME rather than marginal time.

(3) There is maximum use of the rich resources of the parent university and the content of the meetings is drawn from the full-range of knowledge which is the concern of some unit of the university.

While the majority of the conferences are occupationally oriented, there is a definite trend in the direction of more emphasis upon the arts, the humanities, and upon cultural and informational elements more broadening than a narrow focus on job-lore. Interspersed with conferences bearing titles such as "Savings and Loan Executives Course," "Insurance Regulatory Institute" and "Sales Management Seminar," are conferences discussing "Ideals and Religion," "Man as a Social Being," "Art in the Western World," and "A Symposium on Creativity."

With respect both to a "tailor-made" building and to communications equipment, most of the centers have proceeded in a mode of experimentation. For example, the Georgia Center has admittedly experimental square and windowless conference rooms, a hexagonal auditorium, a modernistic panel table which includes a tele-prompter, and uses a tele-autograph for the exchange of messages between members of a panel. The Oklahoma Center is a complex, with each of the buildings therein strategically located to accomplish specific purposes. The New England Center will be constructed in "a natural, wooded environment ready-made for contemplative and imaginative thinking." Officials of all the centers have worked long and hard with architects and builders to design the most efficient facility, furnishings, and communications to contribute toward an optimum atmosphere of learning.

The Foundation investment over a period of fifteen years to assist with the initial program development and to help with construction at the nine residential facilities for continuing education has, we believe, had an influence far beyond the Kellogg-assisted centers. Professor Cyril O. Houle, who is "Mr. Adult Education" to many Americans, believes that continuing education achieved its most intensive and modern form with the launching of the Kellogg-aided centers. There is evidence to indicate that the more than forty such centers that developed during this same fifteen-year span was stimulated by the examples of the Kellogg centers, for we received no less than 53 separate proposals for centers for continuing education between 1957 and 1961.

What of the future both of continuing education and the Foundation's role?

> "As Paul Miller, assistant secretary for education in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, said at a New England Center Conference on Extension Activities, 'There is a collision of forces taking place in the life of the American university today, involving on the one hand the 1000 years of tradition and sentiment about a university, that it could serve best if it remained disengaged from society, and on the other hand the contemporary concerns of an urban industrial society which thrives on knowledge and is calling upon the university not to disengage but rather to seek an engagement with the public process.' Miller saw two worlds in the university: the faculty holding tenaciously to the traditional historic sentiment; the administrators accommodating to the contemporary needs of society in order to get support for the university. And Miller's conclusion was simply that continuing education was going to have to be budgeted as a normal function of an institution much like research and teaching and that, in order to exist, universities were going to have to find straightforward ways of helping continuing education to stand on its own feet."

In the light of this statement and similar assessments, there may be new facets to the Foundation's role in continuing education. Already we have identified a need for more information on the concept of residential university-based continuing education exemplified at the nine Kellogg-aided centers. A Foundation-sponsored full-length book on "Continuing Education" will be published sometime this fall. This volume, which will focus on the planning, operation, and evaluation of these centers, will be followed by a second book, slated for later publication, which will provide a broader critical analysis of continuing education to explain the concept to leadership echelons and to stimulate universities, faculties, and other intellectual communities toward discussion of the topic.

What involvement the Foundation may have with continuing education in the future depends on the type of innovations that emerge in the years ahead. With relatively limited resources a foundation must depend for its impact on short-term support, strategically placed at just the appropriate moment. This is an objective for which we constantly strive, but which we do not always achieve. However, in our pursuit of this goal we try to maintain our sensitivity to development in the fields in which we have elected to concentrate. There is much on the horizon. For instance, the overwhelming growth in the size of university student enrollments may alter some earlier concepts about continuing education. As the "multiversities" wrestle with the problems created by their tremendous size, the once widely held notion that a single centralized continuing education facility can best serve all of the faculties of a university may be modified. Here on the University of Michigan campus a decentralization in continuing education is already underway — I suspect forced partly by size. Three major professions have created their own continuing education centers for engineering, law, and health. The Institute for Continuing Legal Education has drawn regularly as many as 4000 practicing lawyers from all states in the Union for a single educational conference.

The American Association of Junior Colleges has recently set up a committee on continuing education. Many educators seem to be convinced that the time is ripe to move the community colleges into the community service function which they have long cited in their literature but never really developed to its full potential. Continuing education may be one of the key components of this expanded role and such a development would have implications for existing and future university programs.

Instructional innovation in continuing education is widespread and will no doubt continue. Greater use of the theatre to "entertain them hugely while educating them subtly" is meeting with great success at some university centers, and the use of "Comparative cross-examination" of the moot trials of the National Advocacy Institute have achieved national prominence as superb educational experiences for practicing lawyers.

There are a number of fascinating ways in which the undergraduate and continuing education functions may be combined in the future. If the university is to *reach* its undergraduates rather than just to *teach* them, it must instill in them an enthusiasm and dedication for lifetime learning. This function might be assisted by enabling undergraduate students to sit in, electronically, on appropriate continuing education sessions. If it is possible to secure permission from conference groups from time to time, arrangements could be made to have classes eavesdrop on selected sessions of continuing education conferences by the use of closed circuit television. For example, an economics class might gain much by hearing, and later reviewing in class, discussions of the "live" problems with which a group of labor leaders or industrial managers are currently wrestling; or engineering students might grasp the importance of lifetime learning through having an opportunity to see the process by which the practicing engineer must constantly add to his knowledge and skill. This idea is, of course, just another way of bringing the real world inside the ivory tower.

Another pervading theme that seems to be in the air is the need for a consortium of educational institutions engaged in continuing education. Such a relationship could provide a nationwide comprehensive system of continuing education to serve an increasingly mobile population. The pioneer alumni continuing education programs are already approaching this task in relation to the specific groups they wish to serve. They are enlisting other institutions to help them provide continuing education for their widely scattered alumni.

Our Foundation's role in relation to continuing education has been and should remain that of a catalyst. As our president has said, "Now we're receiving inquiries from all over the world about continuing education. You pioneers in continuing education have created a problem for us through your accomplishments. We don't have the money to replicate continuing education centers around the globe, but we do have an obligation to try to establish guidelines that would be helpful to people who want to replicate them." Thus, we are currently underwriting publication of the book on residential, university-based continuing education centers to which I referred earlier, and we reaffirm our belief in the concept of education as a lifetime process.

The Foundation will always have empathy and special regard for continuing education, believing that the knowledge explosion; the onset of automation and the imminence of cybernation; today's social, economic and physical mobility; the obsolescence of the work ethic and the urgency of charting new directions; the explosion of leisure time and the broadening of participation in cultural activities and the arts; are all impressive factors that make mandatory the greater scope and heightened quality of continuing education throughout the world.

SECOND GENERAL SESSION

SUNDAY EVENING, APRIL 23

CONTINUING EDUCATION IN THE MAINSTREAM OF THE UNIVERSITY

(Teacher Education)

By Harold E. Sponberg
President, Eastern Michigan University

During the course of history this nation has been committed to the idea that education is a fundamental premise in our way of life. We have used education in all forms, methods, designs and programs to provide for the well-being of mankind. There have been periods when we have emphasized the intellectual excellence. There have been other occasions when we have emphasized the principle of vocational education with high priorities given to those matters of the hand and skills. There have been other times when we talked about the culture of education involving the arts, music, drama and other elements broadly classified as aesthetic. The universities, as an integral part of our educational system, have been compared to lighthouses whose light radiating in all directions dispels darkness giving hope to the weary mariner and making it possible for him to find his way home. They have been likened to dynamos at some great central station whose power lines reach into every section of the community giving strength and renewing life and energy.

A university consists of something more than a single set of factors. By its very name as well as by its very nature it is universal in purpose and in scope. It sheds light, it develops new power, and it transmits knowledge. But the light it radiates, the power it develops, and the knowledge it transmits do not remain fixed and unchanging generation after generation. The lighthouses must be built taller, the dynamos must be made more powerful, and the knowledge must be disseminated over a wider area if progress is to be made.

As we view universities in the modern day, we recognize that they are not only educational institutions, but that they have great impact on the social and economic life of the people; they also find their source of strength from the people as they create and maintain programs that promote the welfare of the people and advance the cause of civilization. Unless their very atmosphere is permeated with the spirit of unrest and intellectual dissatisfaction, they soon become obsolete objects of tradition and reverence rather than instruments of progress. They do not come into existence nor are they maintained merely because people wish to preserve the past. They are not museums for preserving culture, although, the maintenance of institutions for this purpose is not unworthy; rather, they come into existence to train, to educate successive generations of youth for the work of a new day.

Only the spirit remains generation after generation; the form constantly changes. The various subjects which are necessary for a liberal education change from period to period, from century to century.

Of this we may be reasonably certain as we view the mission of the university. History, valuable as it is, is not a reliable guide for determining progress except as it may reveal trends or tendencies. The force of precedent, which is often the cloak of many, weakens in the face of new methods, new techniques, and a new spirit. This is particularly true in the stirring days when life is taking on habit patterns unlike anything the world has ever seen. Apparently no one can have an adequate conception to the significance of the place of the modern university in this new world without first knowing something about that world itself.

Let us take a look at the philosophy and character of our people.

First of all, our people were characterized by a flight from foreign governments which had for centuries conscripted their service for war, restricted their economic opportunity, denied them political rights, and even after the Reformation, denied them religious freedom. From this background was born a deep distrust for central government, a zeal for individual freedom, and a confidence in personal ability when personal opportunity was unrestricted.

Second, we had an agriculture economy where sustenance could be gleaned from the field and forest. Anyone willing to work was able to eat. If the settled line was beyond the economic reach of an individual, the frontier needed to be pushed only a quarter section farther to provide him with living space. From this situation grew the national conviction that every man was responsible for his own welfare.

Third, the level of skill required to sustain existence in this economy was low, for the most part acquired during the teen age. It was unrelated to education beyond the three R's.

Fourth, the family was the paramount social influence. The family was self-reliant, intra-dependent, work-oriented, and father-disciplined. There were few divorces, no mother who worked outside the home, little leisure time, and few leisure activities for anyone in the family. The time children spent in school involved fewer days of the year and fewer years of their lives than now. For a great majority of our people, almost the whole of life was centered on their family activities in the home and on the farm.

Fifth, we had a land economy. The great value of the nation and of the overwhelming number of citizens centered around the land. The tax support of all local government was almost exclusively land. This was so important that it was used as a device to control central government. The Constitution prohibited the Federal government from levying a direct tax, that is a tax on land and personal property, in order to preserve this prime source of taxation for local government.

Sixth, the size of political subdivisions was dictated largely by geography and travel time. Thus, counties tended to be limited in size to approximately twenty-five miles square in order that the citizen living in the farthest corner have no more than a thirty mile round trip to reach his county seat. He could make this in one day and do business too, on a sunup, sundown schedule. Normal agricultural dispersion of population made county-type political subdivisions democratically equitable in relation to population.

Seventh, the Negro race was a slave race subject to all the attitudes typical to slave owning masters, and they were domiciled on southern farms, uneducated, unskilled and uncultured.

Eighth, the society was so tied to the land that it tended to be immobile. This substantially increased the social influence of family, community and church.

Into this setting came the public college and university, taking upon it the task not only for the dissemination of knowledge, the provision for the opportunity to learn in the formal structure, but to provide the kind of research inspiration that will push back on the frontiers of ignorance and also to render service to all of society beyond those who are currently at the typical age to attend the universities and colleges. These public universities originated in response to public demands and have been maintained, fostered, and encouraged all these years by citizens of the state in which they are located. The origin and the sources from which they have received their support have affected their composition and character. Flourishing in the very soil of democracy, supported and maintained by the people, committed unequivocally to a more highly educated intelligence, the people believed that the road to intellectual opportunity should never be closed, but should be an open door for all those who are willing to make the trial. The state universities, nevertheless, have held in common with the private universities a sense of obligation with regard to the importance of advancing human knowledge, of promoting research, and of training those of superior gifts for special leadership. If the presence of these two points of view in a single type of university be incompatible, then the philosophy that has animated and actuated American life from colonial days to the present time has been based upon false premises.

No state university could survive in a shear intellectual empyrean. It does not reside upon a hill. The professors are not limited to a cloistered life far from the crowd in the market place. They are constantly renewing their strength by returning to the springs from which the sources of strength flow. They are constantly measuring themselves by the extent to which the life of the people whom they are serving has been changed and improved. They are constantly evaluating their effectiveness by the developing and expanding social points of view of their graduates. The university, if it be worthy of the name, is fundamentally and primarily dedicated to the freedom of the human spirit, to the improvement of the advancement of culture, and the liberalizing of the human minds through learning and the search for knowledge.

As time passed we found the spirit and the structure of continuing education entering the life of a university. One of the most articulate exponents of the idea of continuing education was the late Lotus D. Coffman, president of the University of Minnesota from 1920 to 1938. Upon the opening of the Center for Continuation Study in 1936, he made this statement, "It is my opinion that universities should become centers of stimulation within the state for the continuing education of adults who are exercising leadership or in a position to exercise it. A few random lectures delivered here and there will not accomplish much. There is a theory of social psychology to the effect that influences radiate from the centers of stimulation and the more dynamic these centers of stimulation the more powerful of influence. I believe that this is true. I think the work the universities do for the education of adults should be done in the large part at the institutions themselves. Potentially they are the most powerful agencies we possess for promoting adult education in the higher levels.

"The continuing education program would do three things. In the first place it would disseminate the most recent knowledge available in every branch of human learning; secondly, it would stimulate professional interest and growth on the part of the professional leaders; and thirdly, it would give to the people of the state a higher quality of professional service than they could otherwise expect."

As we assume continuing education to be in the mainstream of the university, we have in later years become more convinced that the firm line between education on and off campus has become blurred.

As the universities assume their responsibilities for the education of teachers and intensify their close relationship with the public schools, we find that in the 20th century new criteria for our role as universities. First, we must raise the quality of education in our schools everywhere and for everyone. In the 20th century we cannot tolerate second class education if we intend to remain a first class nation. Secondly, we must bring the equality of educational opportunity to every child in America whatever his color, creed, handicap or family circumstance; thirdly, we must provide vocational and technical education that is geared to the economy and technology of today and tomorrow, not of yesterday; fourthly, to make college and university study possible for all young people who can benefit by it. In our advanced economy we can no longer afford to regard higher education as a luxury. And fifth, we must bring our educational resources to bear directly on problems in our communities as an independent social instrument in fashioning the enlightened society we have chosen to become.

Historically, the teacher education programs at the universities and colleges established the principle of continued education for teachers through summer institutes, extension services, traveling lectures and field courses. Certification standards, curriculum studies, academic improvements, population projections are but a few of the continuing education experiences that represent the outreach of teacher education.

With the passage of the recent federal acts relative to education, the continuing education concept must be enlarged and strengthened. The traditional line of demarcation between on-campus and off-campus programs is rapidly vanishing. The improved academic qualifications of public school personnel represents a new opportunity for university and school cooperation. Here in the field is a wealth of talent, equal to the academic level on the campus, which can be used for the continuing education of teachers in public and private schools.

Future developments in education will find an increase in continuing education among the teacher education curricula. The mainstream will become broader and deeper in the years ahead.

References: Lotus D. Coffman, Julius Nolte, John Gardner, Francis Keppel, Harold Howe, Cy Houle, John Schwertman, Robert Sharer.

Continuing Education for Engineers

R. L. Smith

President, Michigan Technological University

The students who are enrolled and those about to start an educational program have been born in an era of technology that was but a world of fantasy to those of us who went to school in the 1930's. Modern developments have necessitated a multitude of new courses to be added to the engineering and science curricula of our educational institutions and even the creation of new fields, e.g., in engineering—nuclear, Astronautical, environmental, bio-engineering, etc.

The educational field has kept pace fairly well with the rapidly changing technological era and the undergraduate student of today is now taking courses that were only a short time ago specialized graduate courses. Those students enrolled or the future full time college students, will have programs geared for tomorrow's need.

But what about our graduates of yesterday? They are becoming obsolete at an ever increasing pace. Considerable dust has been raised on this whole subject in the engineering profession. Articles have been written, conferences have been held, and surveys have been taken, yet not much real headway has been made.

Theodore Ferdinand has aptly pointed out that obsolescence exists when an individual uses viewpoints, theories, concepts, or techniques that are less effective in solving problems than others currently available in his field of specialization. The vast majority of practicing engineers have had no formal exposure to computer use, their mathematics training stopped at calculus, and modern physics is an unknown area to them.

Most of us think that our own fields are changing more rapidly than those of the other fellow. I'm in no position to argue this, but believe that no longer do years of experience counterbalance the lack of formal education in the newer areas of science and technology. This is especially true in engineering rather than in science because of the nature of the engineer's education. It's based more on current technology and thus becomes outdated rapidly. For this reason, my comments will be confined to engineering.

Ferdinand, in the American Scientist, pointed out that there are three types of obsolescence: (1) in the person's own technical specialty; (2) in his general professional field; and (3) the body of knowledge that is relevant to the work he is supposed to perform. It is important to recognize these differences and what particular mix exists for any given individual before prescribing the continuing education treatment.

Most of us feel most secure when that which we are doing goes on and on with continual output of its kind. This is the ideal setting for obsolescence since we settle complacently in a comfortable, narrow, unchanging niche. We are unprepared technically or psychologically to cope with changes once they do develop. Worse still, an area static for a long time usually takes off at a rapid rate once it does start.

The people interested in continuing education could probably spot these areas with a little research; however, about all they could do would be to ready themselves when the time came because there would be no motivation on the part of the comfortable professional. The primary reason that electronics and defense industries have sprouted up around universities is because the technical personnel are generally up-to-date.

In addition to obsolescence, there's another very important reason why we should direct special efforts at retraining our older engineers and which again is perhaps more severe in engineering than in any other field. A tremendous engineering shortage exists and portends to become critical in the years to come. Some statistics, that although perhaps not 100% accurate, do portray the trend. They have been developed by such agencies as the National Science Foundation, American Council on Education, The Engineers

Joint Council, and the Scientific and Engineering Manpower Commissions.

The demand for engineers went up last year 100% as compared to 30% for most other fields. The U. S. graduated 36,700 engineers, while 72,000 were sought. Every source predicts this trend to continue, yet we graduated fewer engineers this year than we did 20 years ago. I'm talking about absolute numbers, not percentages. It's interesting to point out that while we have gone down from 52,700 graduates in 1949-50 to 36,700 in 1965, the Russians have gone from 40,000 to 125,000 during the same period. Also, in any given year, nearly 100% of the Russian high school students take math, chemistry and physics, while less than 1/3 of the U.S. students take math, less than 10% take chemistry, and less than 5% take physics. The outlook is not too rosy for a continued U.S. lead in technology unless something is done to change this situation.

I think you can see what this has to do with continuing education. The men already graduated are losing ground technically and there aren't enough coming into the field. As a matter of fact, retraining those already in engineering will still be nothing but a stop-gap measure. About 67% of our engineers are between the ages of 25 and 44, while 28% are 45 years of age and older. In short, approximately 95% of our engineers need some form of continuing education study.

Continuing education can help meet this challenge; however four sectors of our society must be involved in this vast educational undertaking. These are industry, governmental agencies, engineering societies, and educational institutions. Industry and government are the employers, engineering societies are a chosen association of the practicing engineer, with an aim of improving his competence. The educational institution forms the academic background. Each of these sectors represents a different set of attitudes, capabilities, and means of participation in the problem of keeping the engineer up-to-date by continuing education.

In order to be effective we cannot walk the path alone. Industry, government, education, and the engineering societies will have to join hands. Government and industry must provide substantial release time, the best of our engineering teachers must develop and teach new courses in summer and evening sessions, while the engineering societies must disseminate tutorial material to their members. Problems which must be solved include:

Motivation of the employer and the individual
Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness and Learning Potential
Cost of such a program.

The problem is not new, but few formal steps were taken to solve it until 1964. In March of that year, the Engineers' Council for Professional Development, in concert with the officers of the American Society for Engineering Education, the Engineers Joint Council, and the National Society of Professional Engineers, appointed the Joint Advisory Committee on Continuing Engineering Studies with two representatives from each organization. Ernst Weber, president of the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, agreed to serve as chairman. Because of the large number of engineers in government, two representatives from government departments in Washington were added.

The findings of this committee were as follows:

INDUSTRY:

> "There is strong economic motivation for industry to protect its investment in its engineering resources. Working with aca-

demic institutions and engineering societies this investment can be protected by considering: the technical sophistication, and the type of industry in which the engineer is placed, the level of his work, his motivation, narrow specialization, and the difference in needs of various disciplines."

GOVERNMENT:

"There is a wide disparity of programs among various agencies of the federal government even though these programs clearly parallel a majority of the methods used in industry. Federally employed engineers place significant weight upon the importance of the availability of continuing engineering studies programs. Adequate statistics and administrative regulations appear to exist to provide opportunities for continuing engineering studies but no machinery presently exists nor are there funds available in the federal government which deal with the overall need for programming to provide federally employed engineers with the means for technical self-renewal."

ENGINEERING SOCIETIES:

"Societies are planning techniques to motivate their members more effectively; are placing greater emphasis on continuing engineering studies; are studying cooperative techniques; are recognizing the need for more active participation in program development."

ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS:

"A different approach to the treatment of knowledge is needed in continuing engineering studies. Such programs must be tailored to specific needs, are best offered under various schedule patterns, should be given at times and locations convenient to the practicing engineer, and should provide some type of recognition other than academic credit. Presentation should not be constrained to traditional teaching methods; examination and grading procedures should be used whenever possible but in modified form; to a greater extent, baccalaureate education should emphasize preparation for future continuing engineering studies."

We in education can stimulate the role of industry, government, and the engineering societies by striving diligently to hold up our end of the program. To do this will require reduction of normal teaching loads, so that teachers can participate in continuing education. It will also require recognition of those individuals who participate in such a program just as recognition is given to the researcher or one who publishes. Teaching continuing education on an "overload" basis should be discouraged, although there is no doubt that some courses will have to be handled in this way. Provisions must be made to make the salary attractive for such "overload" teaching.

Without some plan to continually enhance the capabilities of our engineers and scientists, we stand to lose the effective use of much of our limited supply of technological manpower. While many view the low level of engineering enrollments with alarm, there are relatively few programs aimed at magnifying and stretching the useful professional lives of those who are engaged in these fields.

Michigan Tech conducted a survey among 400 practicing engineers who graduated from Michigan Technological University from 1956 through 1962. The majority of responses indicated a need and a desire to pursue a part time program which will terminate in a master's degree in engineering administration. After two years of working with a company, many practicing engineers find themselves in administrative positions dealing with labor unions and individuals throughout the company, where such background as human relations, labor relations, and engineering administration courses are needed. The study indicated that 72% of the respondents desired refresher training; however, the main reason indicated was to update themselves in their special field. Eighty-two percent of the respondents felt the need for educational broadening in non-engineering areas such as business administration, humanities and mathematics. Eighty-one percent of the respondents indicated a desire to receive credit for the courses they take which could be applied toward a master's degree. This survey also showed that 92% of the alumni would receive some form of financial aid from their employers in continuing their education. The range has been from 50% tuition refunded to 100% of the total cost incurred for loss of wages, books, and tuition.

From the information received, it was noted that only 10% of the graduates have gone on for additional degrees. These advance degrees were obtained mostly in the area of their undergraduate degrees. Many respondents mentioned that they obtained their professional engineering licenses.

Many suggestions have been made on how to approach the problem of continuing engineering education. A coordinated effort on the part of educational institutions is necessary. Regional programs utilizing the capabilities of universities and colleges would seem to be a logical method. Courses, conferences, and seminars should be held with due regard to geographic locations. An effort should be made to provide coverage in depth of research results and technological advancements in a number of areas. Courses should be designed for a reasonable review of a few selected topics of modern developments which are of major importance to industry. Clearly there are many other steps that could be taken.

The National University Extension Association has pioneered continuing education in this country and I see this group as a logical source of aid and guidance in delineating these steps and solving a gigantic problem—continuing education for engineers.

In December of 1966, the American Society of Engineering Education called the first annual meeting of the Continuing Engineering Studies Division. Many of you probably attended that session. When the second meeting of that group is held in the fall of this year, I feel the NUEA should be represented and take an active part by sharing your rich experience of the past.

REFERENCES:

1. B. Gabrielson, "A Study of Continuing Education," Engineering Alumni of Michigan Technological University, 1966.
2. "Continuing Engineering Studies," a Report of the Joint Advisory Committee, ECPD, EJC, ASEE, NSPE, 1965.
3. George A. W. Boehm, "Bringing Engineers Up to Date," Fortune, May 1963, p. 120 ff.
4. William W. Seifert, "The Prevention and Cure of Obsolescence in Scientific and Technical Personnel," Research Management, VII, 1964, pp. 143–154.
5. Samuel S. Dubin and H. Leroy Marlow, "Keeping Up-to-date: Replies from 2090 Engineers," The Department of Continuing Education, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania.
6. Office of Research, American Council on Education, "Fact Book on Higher Education," pp. 180, 242.

PRESENTATION TO THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

MONDAY, APRIL 24

EVALUATION OF TITLE ONE OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

D. Mack Easton
Dean, University Extension
University of Colorado

I am not a community development professional.

I am an extension dean, a couple of years from emeritus.

Why should I attempt to analyze and evaluate—to criticize—the situation which has developed around Title I?

Essentially because I am worried. Essentially because I think that the most important educational opportunity opened up in my lifetime may disappear before it can be effectively acted upon. I hope to communicate that worry. My purpose is both heuristic and polemic. I hope to get you to adopt a specific line of thinking and investigation, and I hope to persuade you to try to do some things which you seem to have only talked about.

I come to you because I think I detect in your thinking and behavior the only promising sign on the horizon.

This is the Community Development Division of NUEA. Let's take a look at how you use the term community development.

Actually, you use it to refer to quite different concepts and phenomena. This is no criticism. It has been decades since Ogden and Richards, I think it was, pointed out that "a word means what it means when it means it," and we are all familiar with the maiden whose "no" meant "maybe."

I want to call attention to some closely-related ways in which you use it.

You use it to define your professional role as educators. Jack Mezirow did this when he said "The community development process is, in essence, a planned and organized effort to assist individuals to acquire the attitudes, skills and concepts required for their democratic participation in the effective solution of as wide a range of community improvement problems as possible in an order of priority determined by their increasing levels of competence." And I don't think that Jack would say that a violation of his principle of priority would invalidate the rest of his definition.

Some of you may remember that I tried to tell you at your Gull Lake seminar that this concept lies at the very heart of one of the oldest conceptions of the purpose of education—*educare liberos*—the development of persons able to deal rationally with their problems.

You also use the term to indicate what happens to the individual in the community process. Bill Biddle did this when he said, "Basically, community development is a social process by which human beings can become more competent to live with and gain some control over local aspects of a frustrating and changing world."

You also use the term to refer to the total process itself, by which intended community change leading to an improvement of the community as such is achieved.

And you use the term to refer to the results of the process.

I think I detect, however, a common element in these four uses of the term. I think most of you agree on a criterion of success. Whether your attention is on the educator's behavior, the development of the learner, the social process of intended change, or the end result—in all these cases, you seem to agree that the sign of success is that the *community is improved.*

Sometimes, as in Darby, Montana, or in some of Cooperative Extension's rural area development work, the focus has been on economic development, because the community was economically sick—it had a contracting economic base.

Sometimes, as in some of the communities in the program of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the focus has been esthetic or cultural—because the community was unattractive or culturally deprived.

Sometimes, the focus has been on the physical environment in more than an esthetic sense—as in programs leading to urban renewal or improved housing.

Sometimes the focus has been on a social problem, such as a culturally deprived minority, or race relations, or delinquency.

The common element has been the purpose of making the community better—a place where life becomes better through a process of social change intentionally carried out—as opposed to unintended change. And the criterion of success is genuine community improvement.

So conceived, the role of the community developer is, like medicine, a role in applied science, with many empirical elements. And like medicine, it itself is an art, for the same reason that Aristotle pointed out long ago: There is no science of the individual, and all communities, like all persons, are to some extent unique.

You are, then, physicians to the community, interested in stimulating the social processes by which community health can be improved, as medicine is interested in stimulating the biological and psychological processes by which individual health can be improved.

Never has the need for this role been so critical in the history of this civilization.

In personal terms, remember what Joe Brown told you at Carbondale—that the types and rates of change in contemporary society are leading to accelerating rates of human wreckage—in terms of delinquency, crime, mental illness and suicide.

In physical terms, look at urban blight, rural de-population, traffic congestion, slaughter on the highways. Lincoln's log cabin was much less pathogenic than an urban slum. My grandfather's community a hundred miles from a railroad was a much healthier economic unit than many shrinking rural villages of today. New York's horse cars actually got people to their destination faster than New York's buses today. And all the wars we have ever been in have killed fewer Americans than the automobile has killed.

In social terms, look at the plight of the poorer third of our fellow-citizens—socially isolated, culturally deprived, increasingly underemployed, mostly hopeless—a society of degradation inside an affluent society. A hundred years ago, the indentured penniless orphan could learn farming on the job, save money for a team and a plow after his indenture was ended, and move onto free land to build an upward-bound career for himself and his children. Today, millions of children are condemned to failure before they are old enough to enter school.

But no matter what comparisons you make between two points in time, remember what Margaret Meade has put so well: The most important change we must deal with is the change in the rate of change.

I honestly believe that the continued existence of our civilization depends on our ability to deal rationally with the problems, existing and emerging, with which we are faced. Western civilization has a long past, but it may have a short future.

Not all these existing and emerging problems are community problems, but many are. They are the ones we are concerned with this morning.

And they are the ones with which Title I of the Higher Education Act is concerned.

Title I authorizes appropriations "For the purpose of assisting the people of the United States in the solution of community problems . . ." (Sec. 101) It puts no limits on the types of community problems involved, but it does illustrate Congressional intent: ". . . housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health and land use . . ." (Sec. 101) These are as urgent as any I know, and there is not a simple one in the lot.

The act calls for 54 "state" plans, each of which must "set forth a comprehensive, coordinated, and statewide system of community service programs." (Sec. 105 (a) (2)) Several of these words we will need to come back to: *Comprehensive* can mean "inclusive, not limited." *System* can mean "an integrated whole." *Community Service Programs* is limited by law to educational programs designed to assist in the solution of community problems. Other kinds of community service are not eligible for funds. The bill passed by the Senate was not this narrow. I think you should know that when both houses had acted and the bills were on their way to a conference committee, I attempted to influence the committee in the direction of the broader (Senate) version.

And I think you should know why. I wrote to two members of the conference committee. Perhaps one paragraph of the letter is enough for our purposes this morning.

> I think it is fair to say that the development of service units designed to serve the whole community is only in its pioneering stage in American universities. The kind of man who can assist the members of a community to identify the community's problems, to make judgments on priorities, to bring to bear on those problems the analytical skills, special know-how, planning ability and leadership skills (whether available in the community or brought in from outside) necessary to deal with the problems—this kind of man is in very short supply, in the judgment of some of us who have held key positions in our national organizations. Yet, without this kind of social catalyst, the House Title I will inevitably lead to the development of discrete community services, not necessarily attacking the most important problems of communities at all.

I want to make it clear that my objection was to the tremendous difficulty involved in launching soundly conceived educational programs designed to deal effectively with community problems in 54 states and territories at the same time under current manpower conditions. If the social situation is what I think it is, Title I of the Higher Education Act is *po-*

tentially more important than the Smith-Lever Act, in spite of the fact that the industrial, economic, scientific, educational and cultural progress we have seen since 1915 could not have occurred, for want of manpower, had it not been for the rise in agricultural productivity per man in which agricultural extension played so large a part. We have fewer farmers today than during the Civil War. All our growth in population has been available for other occupations.

Title I is potentially even more important, and potentially a failure. If it fails, our attempts to deal with the destructive aspects of change will receive a dangerous set-back which could lead to catastrophic consequences.

Why is it potentially a failure?

The universities aren't ready for it. And they aren't ready for it in several respects.

One of the most critical factors may lie in the difference between serving individuals, formal organizations, and communities. Let me remind you of just one example of this difference. Both in the case of individuals and of formal organizations, you know who it is that you must teach. In the case of communities, whose opinions count on what subjects and what they must be taught have to be discovered. Neither faculty members nor ordinary extension men often know how to do this. Sometimes you don't do too well yourselves. And there aren't many of you.

Another critical factor is the nature of community problems. There is a sense in which communities do not have medical problems, engineering problems, educational problems, economic problems, communication problems, or psychological problems—they have community problems with medical, engineering, educational, economic, communications, and psychological aspects—and others besides.

Such problems need a comprehensive, systematic approach—just what Title I asks for. Community problems are seldom solved by dealing with discrete aspects in isolation. Let's look at an example.

Such urban problems as housing, transportation, land use and recreation all involve a need for good urban planning.

But to raise the competence of the professional planners won't be effective. To raise the competence of the planning commissions won't be effective.

To raise the competence of the urban officials won't be effective.

To increase the understanding of the voters won't be effective.

To improve the quality of the mass media won't be effective.

To solve the problem of financing the work won't be effective.

To do all of these things, in the right order, at the right time might be effective—but, on the other hand, there may be still other critical factors. I have mentioned phases of the problem involving a half-dozen professions and disciplines just to get rational *planning* with regard to a problem. Much more must be done if it is to be *solved.*

Universities are not used to such comprehensive, inter-disciplinary, inter-professional programs. Only a few are organized to make them even possible.

As Piet Hein, the Dane, has put it "All problems lose their meaning when we amputate them, cut off what we want in order to make them fit into our random frames of specialization." Yet this is the customary way for the academic specialist to work.

The universities were not ready for Title I because most of them had no knowledge of how to work with a community as a client—particularly an urban community—and because they were not prepared for a comprehensive, systematic approach to community problems. Need I go further?

Heroic efforts have sometimes overcome such handicaps. And I think heroic efforts were clearly involved in getting the program started. If I remember correctly, 49 state plans were developed and approved in less than three months. That is real evidence of heroic work by the Office of Education, the state agencies, and the educational institutions.

But where are we today?

Jules Pagano reported to a group of extension deans in November—and the report is printed in the December-January *Spectator*—that thirty-three percent of all Title I funds was being spent "to improve the professional or technical skills of such groups as doctors, teachers and civil servants. Two percent of the funds goes to devising self-help programs for the aging.

"Seventeen percent of the funds goes to urban and regional development . . . About five percent goes to help solve the problems of racial discrimination and racial tension." Etc.

This does not sound like a comprehensive attack on anything.

I have examined in detail a roster by states of all projects granted fiscal 1966 funds. I think it fair to say that an overwhelming majority—almost all—seem to be discrete, isolated, attacks on a single phase of a complex problem.

This was to be expected. It was the only way to get started fast, considering the way the law was written. But if this pattern becomes precedent, the program may well be doomed.

I say *may,* because I am depending on a pipe-line to Congress which may be unreliable, and because I am not confident that I grasp adequately the mood of the people who count in this situation. I *feel* a blunt "will be doomed" is justified.

Why?

My pipeline reports that Congress is tired of statistical reports on the number of people served, the hours of service—in general, the data on intermediate phenomena. The members of Congress want end results. They ask, "What difference did it make?" "Did it get the results intended? Was the net effect an improvement?" And an increasing number of voters are concerned about slum re-development projects that improve the real estate but displace the slum dweller and aggravate the social problems. They are increasingly concerned about free-way construction which increases highway capacity without increasing traffic efficiency and does it at the cost of blighting neighborhoods and aggravating other social problems. They are increasingly concerned about programs which increase the education of members of minorities without opening up opportunities for that education to be put to constructive use. The concern in Washington itself may be reflected in the Model Cities program, which makes possible the coordination of the broadest spectrum of therapeutic action ever possible in this country—a spectrum of which everything that can be done under Title I is a minor part.

If we had to start with discrete projects attacking selected facets of complex problems, if we must show tangible results in terms of community improvement, if this kind of result cannot be achieved by the kinds of projects currently going on, we need some leadership some place.

And I think this really is the situation. I have not been able to investigate the projects funded with fiscal 1967 funds, but in our state they constitute smaller projects attacking isolated elements of more problems than the previous year. They should have strengthened ongoing work and supplemented it by attacking other elements in the same problems involved in the first year's programs.

If my state is reasonably typical, we need someone to lead us from project-oriented thinking to problem-oriented thinking, from the approach by discipline or profession to the comprehensive approach.

In theory, the needed leadership could come from any of a number of sources.

It might come from the national council established under Title I. I don't think it can. That council includes two outstanding leaders in general university extension, but neither is a student or practitioner in the field of intended community change. And I don't think anyone else on the council is.

It might come from the federal agency. When Jules Pagano spoke to some deans in November, I thought I saw signs justifying optimism. If you have read his talk in the *Spectator,* you may have had the same impression. But current signs are discouraging. Let me cite two such signs.

I have copies of two letters from Washington which state that the identification of community problems is the responsibility of the state agency. This statement will suggest to many readers that the state agency will send a person or persons into a community with the attitude "You have a delinquency problem which is so bad I have been sent to help you solve it. Let's start a seminar next week for the city council, the school board and superintendent, and the police chief."

I would hate to enter a community under such circumstances. I think at least most of you will agree that community problems must be recognized by the community. I doubt whether the state agency should normally do more than judge priorities and programs on the basis of professional staff work.

I also have a copy of the "Notice of Activation . . . ."form for Title I programs. It asks, among other things, for:

1. Names of cooperating institutions
2. Cost per participant
3. A detailed description of the program, including "program content, the methods and materials to be employed, the faculty resources involved, and, where applicable, the frequency and duration of sessions."

I suggest that the language of this form will tend to influence institutions to stay in the most traditional patterns of group instruction. Jules Pagano may appeal all he wants to for rational innovations, but he can't expect effective ones if such language is used in requiring official reports.

Don't misunderstand me. The solution of many community problems probably involves the group instruction of adults on an unprecedented scale. But this activity is not at the heart of intended social change. By themselves, such programs are what Piet Hein called the amputation of parts of a problem to fit random frames of specialization.

Don't expect the needed leadership under current conditions from the federal agency. I can find no evidence that the agency comprehends the problem of evoking and securing effective processes of desired social change.

In theory, the leadership could come from the state agencies. Read their names. To me, they suggest no grounds for hope.

In Colorado, the state agency is the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. It has a small staff composed of excellent professional men. However, they have *not* been selected for their competence in guiding or assisting social change. They can't give the needed leadership—they are part of the need.

In theory, the leadership could come from the universities. I have already indicated why, as institutions, they, too, are part of the need. Most of them are not used to serving communities as clients, and most of them are not organized for comprehensive programs.

Gentlemen, I am convinced that if effective leadership emerges at all, it must come from this group here, from this Division of NUEA.

Maybe my analysis is wrong. It is an administrator's analysis, based on available information some of which is no more than ambiguous signs. But if you look at the society from which the program emerges, if you examine Congressional intent and expectations, if you examine the act and the regulations, if you look at the federal and state agencies and the institutions involved, if you look at what has happened to date, if you look at the possible sources of leadership, including yourselves, I think you will come to the conclusion I have reached.

To be sure, there are elements in the situation about which I have said nothing—university presidents, for instance. I don't think, however, you can find any such un-named element in the situation from which you can reasonably expect the needed initiative.

I know you have other things to do. I know you are busy. But the university extension movement could not have reached its current development without a lot of self-sacifice by many men, and, as the Bible puts it, "To him who knoweth to do and doeth it not, to him it is sin."

I want to recommend the line of action taken by two physicians in Dakota concerning a patient who was critically ill. At one point in their consulting, one said to the other, "Amoebic dysentery in South Dakota seems impossible. But I agree that is what it looks like. You start treatment on that basis at once and I'll make the laboratory tests to see if we are right." The plan was followed and the patient recovered. If they had made the lab tests before starting treatment, the patient would have died.

So start checking my analysis of symptoms to see if my diagnosis is wrong.

But also start, today, to treat the patient.

Set up lines of communication with the federal agency. What happened to the plan you adopted last year—in the resolution presented by Bosworth? I think that plan made lots of sense. The men I know in the federal agency are intelligent, dedicated men. I am sure they will listen if you put first things first, and a continuing dialogue is needed.

But this is only one step you should take at once. I would like to see you develop methods of orienting both the agencies and the institutions. They need to learn what a "comprehensive system" is, as the term refers to Title I programs. They need some insight into the process of goal-oriented community change. They need to understand the need for coordination at the local level on a basis much broader than Title I. Perhaps we need a national institute or workshop. Perhaps it could be the joint effort of you and the federal agency. I have some ideas on the subject I will be glad to leave with your chairman and with the federal agency, but they should be viewed as part of the beginning and not as a finished program plan.

I think you should also take a third step—maybe a third and a fourth. We need more professionals, and approximations of professionals to meet the current emergency. I propose you do two things about the problem:

1. Look over the national scene and see if you can find some way by which either professional curricula can be established at more universities or the output of the graduate curricula which already exist can be increased, or a combination of both.

2. See if you can develop effective short programs for the in-service orientation and training of persons currently responsible for Title I work.

I strongly recommend all four of these steps: cooperation with the federal office, orientation programs for the state agencies and educational institutions, increased output of professional curricula and first-aid in-service programs for people currently responsible for Title I work. By the time you have finished your own diagnosis, you may find other ways to improve the situation.

We must find some way to get beyond what Jack Mezirow last year called "unrelated and ephemeral" projects.

The communities which are our patients will not be cured by treating the symptoms or by treating individual organs.

The patient can only be made reasonably healthy by improving the volume and the quality of the decisions and actions involved in effective community change for positive values. He is suffering from acute projectitis involving a breakdown of the communication processes of his central nervous system. Check the diagnosis, but start treatment immediately.

In case you lack confidence in your own wisdom, let me end by quoting Piet Hein again:

The road to wisdom?—Well, it's plain and simple to express:

Err
and err
and err again
but less
and less
and less

PRESENTATION TO THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

MONDAY, APRIL 24

STUDENTS, SCHOOLS, SERVICE AND SOCIETY — A NEW MIX

Joseph G. Colmen
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

These are exciting times in education. Education is now a growth industry. It is as much a part of contemporary culture as the corporation, and shares headlines with war, crime and baseball. It has become exciting, both to the people who work in it, and hopefully the students who are subjected to it. There are ferment and innovation, psychological alarm at costs along with greater financial support, critiques and defenses about everything from computer assisted instruction of pre-schoolers to the effect of racial isolation on student achievement to the balance of teaching versus research at the graduate level. Most exciting of today's dialogues, however, concerns the role of the school and the student in the changing processes of society.

Early debaters were sharply divided in their views of the role of the educational system as a participant in social change. The "four-walls" concept presented the school as an isolate, detached from the outside world by a curriculum curtain that was the fabrication of and the province of the educationist. Except for occasional forays by educational analysts or well-intended PTA groups, schools were free of outside influence, for they knew best how to educate our youngsters and for what. On the other hand, faced with society's festering sores, recently exposed to an angry nation and world another group took to question whether or not the schools really knew (1) how to educate, but more important, (2) for what to educate. This group asked whether or not the school should be part of the community in a practical-working, as opposed to a theoretical-academic sense.

Colleges in an Ecological System

How do schools fit into their communities as social and cultural systems? Shouldn't a school or college see itself as part of a larger ecological system in which it fosters everything from social welfare to urban rehabilitation? If so, James Perkins, president of Cornell, charges that "We have not been very inventive about how to relate studies and experience or thought and action, and the result can be frustration, or apathy, or even revulsion on the part of good students." Relate that statement to Berkeley, Howard, CCNY and, to a less visible degree, hundreds of other campuses.

Some institutions today, such as a college being established as part of a newly forming city called Columbia, about midway between the creeping metropolises of Washington and Baltimore, are seeking for a design which will train people for involvement in the dynamics of social process.

Several weeks ago, Buell Gallagher, president of New York City College, served notice that his 120 year-old muncipal institution was ready—in fact, eager—to come down from its ivory tower. He asked the city's board of education to let the college operate five public schools in Harlem so it could demonstrate how community and university cooperation could lead to improved education for the youngsters. He might well have added that it could lead to improved education for the college student as well, much as the Peace Corps has shown that the period of work and service abroad is as much a learning experience for the volunteer as it is an education and aid to those he serves.

Colleges and universities are thus taking a new look at their purposes and at the roles of their faculty, administrators and students. And they are asking whether or not they can achieve in the university a sense of community, in which the process of learning is not limited to the academic experience but rather is part of the total living, working and playing experience of the college, the community, the nation, the world.

A new identity is, in fact, beginning to be assumed by the colleges, an emerging public role of the university in American life. The complex demands of a specializing society, in which new knowledge is a critical factor of growth, have found the university sought after more than ever before to help in research, training and consultation on problems of economic and social development both at home and abroad. The modern university is beginning to involve itself in the function of social participation along with its historic mission of observer and critic of public affairs. Forms of social participation, including ways of guarding against becoming an agency merely performing random tasks assigned by the federal government, are now being assessed by universities throughout the nation. Whatever the outcome of this assessment, it is reasonable to expect that the future mission of the public universities, if not the private universities, will include much more emphasis upon the broad concept of public service as a base for educating students, for research and for resolution of what we may refer to as an identity crisis.

One might also anticipate that this change in the outlook and mission of the universities will affect the academic curriculum to the extent that, more and more, the academic classroom will not be bound by space but will be projected throughout the world via television, actual study groups or working parties moving to the "action," wherever it may be found.

Students and Social Change

So much for the university as an evolving institution in terms of its interface with the world around it.

College students today are searching for real world educative experiences which will test theory in practice and will permit inductive development of new theoretical formulations in their chosen fields of study. Unlike the students of the 50's, the so-called silent generation or apathetic conformists, they are looking for ways to contribute directly to the solution of society's significant problems. Dissatisfied with the world as handed to them by their parents, they seek innovative, dynamic solutions based on new sets of premises. But their opportunities are limited.

Father Ted Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University, says, "There is something a little sick about the present system of higher education. Looking at its total spectrum, all the way from lower education through the Ph.D., and post-doctoral, I think it might best be described in the favorite adjective of modern students—'unreal' . . ." "We put people in this thing almost as participants in an oriental dance, where they go through all these motions and yet learn very little about themselves or the world they live in, or about other people, although they may learn a great deal in this amorphous area we call "cognitive."

Jacqueline Grennan, president of Webster College, adds that "Learning is not essentially expository, but exploratory. It happens out in the world of action, a new ecumenical world of search. This search has led many young people into protest and many more into such public service as the Peace Corps, VISTA, American Friends Service Committee and Papal Volunteers."

Harold Taylor, former president of Sarah Lawrence College, challenges that "In the past, the student has been considered an unavoidable element in the educational process, more to be coped with than to be treated as a responsible young adult. We have fallen short of making the call for service into a philosophy of education for a democratic society." This view may be shifting as a plan of national service for all Americans, male and female, is debated and shaped. One observer of the national scene believes that "national service will not come in a single big legislative push but in a series of small developments . . . "Some see it as an extension of the present system of compulsory education . . . It is not just a matter of helping the poor: the middle class youth, tired of his car and his clothes, is discerned to be badly in need of a sense of commitment."

The need is present for a massive expansion of opportunity for college students to express this sense of commitment, to be participants in and architects of the experientally hastened social change here and abroad. As Harold Taylor goes on to say, "The world recognizes citizens and leaders who can tolerate ambiguity and who are not perplexed by paradox . . . Demands must be made on schools and colleges to produce graduates who can cope effectively with confusing situations, which have no *one* best solution (and often seemingly no one *good* solution)." ". . . in such ambiguous situations as peace and war, human rights, the politics of change and the reform of education." If this is so, the world, in addition to the classroom, must be their laboratory.

While only a relative handful of students currently are participating in truly worthwhile community service programs, it is likely that many more would participate if a formal program, structured within the university, were made available. Such a program would offer various experiences in public service for students wishing to participate.

Human-Public Service Manpower Needs

At the same time that universities are pondering their meaning in a new and changing social order and students are searching for their place in that order, a great manpower demand, particularly in the public service, or more broadly human service, sector of our society is about to submerge us. A study by Herman Neibuhr, assistant to the president of Temple University for urban affairs (note his title), projects a shortage of four million such workers by 1972, just to meet demands already on the books, in fields like health, education, welfare, justice, city planning, urban administration, housing transportation and the like. One of the most important but less discussed breaks on Great Society programs has been the lack of qualified manpower at the federal, state, local and private levels. Employment in the public sector is expected to expand still more as society makes more demands for services. The need is therefore evident for ways to bring into human service fields more trained manpower.

If the college and universities would create systems for providing integrated human service learning and work experiences for students, it is likely that many of those students, testing themselves against the pragmatic reality of such work, would opt for careers in these fields. This statement is supported by evidence from Peace Corps research which shows that college graduates from both liberal arts and technical professional persuasions more frequently switch their career choices after Peace Corps service to human service fields than vice versa. Thus, colleges and universities have within themselves the capacity to produce a larger supply of needed human service manpower than they might otherwise by providing opportunity for meaningful service as part of the educational process.

Public Service Training

From the foregoing analysis, it is a short step to see how the needs of colleges, students, and society come together in one focal concept: that of education cum work-service. That step, it seems to me, is establishment of a college-public service training program which eventually would consist of units in most of the colleges and universities of the nation.

The program for college-public service training recognizes that many college students will not be able, for reasons of finance, interests, or obligations, to engage in public service activities once out of school. But while in school, they have time, idealism, need to test themselves in a variety of situations and frequently uncertainty about what they might do with their lives. The program would be conducted at junior colleges, colleges, and universities wishing to affiliate. Though participation of institutions and students would be voluntary, we believe that students themselves would exert pressure at many institutions to create a college-public service training program.

The program would engage students in an integrated process of seminars, workshops, and practical service activity, either during the school term or on vacation periods.

Special courses and seminars would be designed in blocks around the interests, aptitudes, and abilities of the particular students, and the kinds of service activities available in the program. Registration in the program might provide academic credit, if the institution so desired. Faculty for the academic positions might preferably be recruited from off-campus agencies and organizations. Courses would not duplicate those given as part of the regular curriculum. Instead, the program would attempt to develop practical skills around the theory of the regular courses and prepare members for the actual working assignment. In addition, they would serve an integrative function in cutting across departmental or disciplinary lines, as for example in work on social change or community development.

Students in the professional schools, as well as the liberal arts, would be encouraged to participate. For example, students preparing to become lawyers might be assigned to public legal clinics for the indigent, or to a public attorney's office. The seminars for these students might be arranged by teams of teachers, including lawyers, sociologists, social psychologists, municipal judges, social workers, and others. In the field of medicine, premedical students might serve as physicians' assistants in public health clinics or hospitals. Undergraduate students in the liberal arts would be assigned according to their interests, as for example as assistants to public school teachers, social workers, the staff of local poverty programs, and in the offices of county extension agents.

The sponsoring institution would establish links for service activity with governmental or private agencies in their communities and surrounding areas, or might form consortia to provide a broader base of choice to the student. A great deal of planning, liaison, and imagination would be required to locate and arrange service activities. In some cases, students themselves might administer the program in somewhat the same manner as the splendid experiment at San Francisco State University. Private as well as public agencies would be asked to participate. Both should be eager for the assistance of interested, enthusiastic students, and the potential recruiting base they would offer.

Upon graduation, participating students might choose to go directly into public service work. They would have the advantage of directly usable experience. Others may decide to study further for advanced degrees in fields. Students who do not elect to make a career of public service will have benefited personally from their experience and may well continue to involve themselves in genuine service activities over an entire lifetime. Their business or other activities cannot help but be influenced by this experience.

The costs to an institution for a proposed college-public service training program would be basically to establish and administer the academic portion, on the one hand, and to solicit and monitor relevant work-service opportunities for the participants on the other. A desirable adjunct might include a small hourly stipend for each student. The costs, without student stipend, would be relatively small. Students or returned Peace Corps or VISTA volunteers might manage the program at nominal cost. Community organizations, public or private-voluntary, might be willing to share part of the costs, after understanding the potential recruiting advantages of the program. Some of these agencies would provide the academic faculty without cost, though a careful selection process for this critical task is essential.

There are several possible federal sources of supplementary funding which are worthy of note:

(1) The college work-study program next year anticipates 1,700 institutional applications. Many of these programs place students in human service activities. Last year, more than 6,000 students were involved in such activities serving Mexican Americans, American Indians, Appalachians, Negroes, Puerto Ricans, migrants, juvenile delinquents, dependent children, handicapped, aged, and prisoners. Almost 50,000 of last year's 190,000 students served in municipal, State and non-OEO federal agencies.

Here are a few examples of their efforts:

At the California State College at Long Beach, 350 jobs were established with 16 off-campus agencies. Since a large number of students eligible had declared a vocational goal of teaching, many worked as teacher aides in nearby local school districts. The college also has a program with a nearby Veterans Administration Hospital where positions have been established for pre-medical, pre-dental and nursing students.

At Carnegie Institute of Technology in Pittsburgh, engineering and architectural students assisted with a program developed by Action—Housing, Inc., through which residents of low-income blocks with much deteriorated housing are helped through training, technical service, and other aids to make livable and attractive their own housing and neighborhood environment. Work-Study students have also worked with United Neighborhood Houses of Allegheny County as semi-professional advisers for citizens' committees in the preparation of proposals and designs to be submitted to the Urban Renewal Authority of Pittsburgh.

While Office of Education guidelines for college work-study stipulate that students selected must be in need of financial assistance, they do enable universities to develop their own programs for work opportunities for students.

The college work-study program therefore provides a basis for developing work-service opportunities of the college-public service training program and paying stipends to needy students.

(2) Title III of the Higher Education Act provides support for "developing institutions." A developing institution is defined as one which is making a reasonable effort to improve the quality of its teaching and administra-

tive staffs and of its student services; and is, for financial or other reasons, struggling for survival and is isolated from the main currents of academic life.

In concert with work-study which could pay stipends to students and costs of developing work-service opportunities, Title III could pay for the academic side of the proposed public service training program. Some 300 to 400 "developing institution" applications will be supported for next year.

(3) A proposed Public Service Education Act has already been introduced into the Congress. This bill would authorize experimental programs for *graduate* level students in certain fields, such as study combined with part-time public service.

While federal support for the college-public service training program will be limited for the time being, there is a sense of urgency to establish it soon. From the point of view of the university extension interests, I see in this plan a long-needed bridge between inside and outside from which a stronger partnership with all parts of the university will emerge. As a way of entering the arena of social participation, I believe that colleges and universities have an obligation to invest some of their own resources in the plan. Employers for whom students will render services and from whose services they may expect to benefit have an obligation to support it as well. The federal government, through already existing programs, may be able to help "developing institutions" and needy students, which in combination would provide the resources for practically all of the program. Non-needy students might participate without stipends, in the volunteer spirit of those thousands who picket, parade, and work for civil rights; tutor disadvantaged children in ghettoes and slums; and assist developing peoples in Peace Corps.

We would like in the next 12 months to see at least one great college or university in each State develop an innovative, model college-public service training program. If efforts to do so prove it viable and effective, I believe more public financial support can be forthcoming.

As President Kennedy so eloquently admonished us: ". . . let it again demonstrate that politics and art, the life of action and the life of thought, the world of events and the world of imagination are one . . ."

PRESENTATION TO THE DIVISION OF EVENING COLLEGES AND CLASS EXTENSION

MONDAY, APRIL 24

ADVENTURE AND THE EMERGING ROLES OF THE ADULT EDUCATION LEADER

Howard McClusky
Professor of Adult Education
University of Michigan

I would like to begin by taking a fresh cut at some factors which are making the continuing education of adults a concern of growing centrality for our times. . . . First let us look at what I like to call the concept of margin. It can be simply stated, but has important implications for our argument. Margin is a function of the relationship of load to power. By load we mean the self and social demands required by a person or agency to maintain a minimal level of autonomy. By power we mean the resources, i.e., abilities, possessions, position, allies, etc., which a person or agency can command in coping with load. We can increase margin by reducing load or by increasing power and we can control margin by modifying either power or load. . . . If . . . load and power can be controlled, and better yet, a person or agency has a margin of unutilized power, he has more autonomy, as an adult he is prepared to meet unanticipated exigencies, can respond to more options, can in fact engage in exploratory, innovative, creative activities, can take risks, etc. i.e., do those things that make him more than a self-maintaining vegetable.

Because of increasing health, more and better education, and growing economic resources, the margins of both persons and the society are growing. These margins can, and will be devoted more and more to education, which will in turn create more power. As a consequence the domain of the educational enterprise will escalate to dimensions which we can not yet fully foretell.

Another factor contributing to a growing demand for the continuing education of adults brings up our familiar theme of change. The character of change can range on a continuum from a minor incremental adaptation of an existing situation, all the way to a complete transformation of the situation, or a substitution of something wholly new. As one moves from the minor to the radical points on this continuum, one moves from a minor to radical need for education. My point is that change is becoming more and more radical, leading to more and more changes in kind, as well as changes in degree. And returning to the point of margin, I believe this is in part attributable to the fact that both persons and the society are using their margins to produce change, e.g. the research and development departments of industry.

But the rate of change is also significant. Here we have at least two subproblems. One could be charted as a simple linear increase, where rate of increase would be known and outcomes predictable. Another would be curvilinear with rate accelerating and outcomes unpredictable. In both cases our educational task would be complicated by the stage that an individual or agency or community occupies in the career cycle of the problem involved.

What briefly do we mean by the career cycle of a problem? Simply that issues, difficulties, problems, etc., do not arise suddenly out of nothing. They have a history, a beginning, a latency, a fluctuating rise, fall, and a varying amount of arousal potential. They simmer, subside, re-appear, accumulate, heat up. You will note I am being loose with my language. But it all adds up to what I call a career cycle. In a simpler society, and when change was slow if not glacial, for practical purposes time would often take care of the situation. If it were a crisis, you could sit still and things would blow over, or if it were gradual, people could habituate and adapt. For many people and in some places, this is still probably true. But because many problems today are cumulative and rate of change so great this is less and less true. In fact, one characteristic of our current scene is that many problems now occupy an advanced stage in their career cycle and the lead time that may be applied to their solution is rapidly running out.

One of these is obviously the plight of the inner industrial cities, the pollution of Lake Erie is probably another, control of nuclear energy for the world as a whole, the population explosion, and returning home, race relations. There are others which are parallel examples in personal living, such as prevention of illness, maintenance of health, house, income, etc.

In other words, in the career cycle of many personal, agency, community, or institutional, and social problems, there is a potential "moment of truth" which can and should be anticipated well in advance of its appearance. . . .

I said that I wanted to take a fresh cut at factors which are generating a climate increasingly favorable to the education of adults. I have said that increase of margin for both individual and the society increase both the opportunity and need for education, and I also have argued that rate and character of change gives an educative approach to the future a special significance and urgency for adult education.

In continuing my case I wish now to turn psychological. In short I believe that our argument becomes more compelling when to the points of margin and change we add the growing evidence of the adult's ability to make an educative if not creative response to the demands of life long living. The insight coming to us from personality, life cycle and learning theory in my judgment gives us reason to take a much more positive view of the developmental potential of adults than we ever have done in the past. Very few doubt anymore that we teach an old dog new tricks, but there is a growing body of evidence to indicate that there may be some tricks that only an old dog can best learn.

More specifically I believe that the typical curves of growth, i.e., increase, flattening, and decrease or growth maintenance and decline, are more a reflection of the adult condition than a reflection of adult potential. For example tests of psychological ability indicate that general ability to learn lasts at a high level well into the late sixties and seventies. But some subabilities survive better than others. Again, personality theory and learning indicate that anxiety and the ego defenses against anxiety can have a major impact on learning, especially creativity. Finally, learning theory indicates that experience can under proper conditions, become an enormous asset in learning, but can become fully implemented only when properly used. When one realizes then that so much of adult life is loaded with anxiety and the repetition of the familiar rather than free risk taking, and exploratory discovery of the new, it is no wonder that adult performance reflects the charts and descriptions so often ascribed to it.

To use the concept of margin, most adults appear to possess or use little margin for learning and growth and according to the law of exercise, fail to cultivate the potential of which they are capable. In a recent research, one of our doctoral candidates turned up extremely convincing evidence that adults past 65 with a history of participation in life long learning were much happier, better adjusted and more productive than those who did not so participate. Even if you argue that the investigation favored persons who are by nature participative, you would still be forced to concede the importance of the reinforcing value of learning. . . .

At this point I wish to turn to a different category of discussion. I want to do a brief critique of the social scene and by so doing suggest some areas of adventure wherein the adult educator might operate.

First I am concerned about the source and character of some of the values that dominate so much of the direction and preferences of our behavior. In too many instances value is based on relative position in a scale of prestige, power or status and not on the intrinsic and unranked worth of events, products, things and people. In some cases I believe this trend is almost pathological.

Another cause for concern related to the value systems of our society is an overemphasis on instrumental values at the expenses of values derived from expressive and appreciative experience. Adult education can provide an important corrective in this domain. It need not consist of a percentile ranking of the performance of its students, and it could provide one place where a full bodied response to an educational offering is respected in its own right.

Second I am concerned about the excesses of and side effects of specialization. True: specialization is to a degree responsible for our fabulous economic production and expertise. And in the academic realm it is the source of prestige and advancement. Also, it will not go away simply by talking about it. But in excess in society it is often the cause of alienation and in colleges and universities it produces some of the most serious dilemmas with which the higher learning must contend. Specialization is often the enemy of education. "The menace of the uneducated expert" is no idle quip. In my judgment adult education has a better opportunity to restore balance to the instructional scene than any other aspect of the educational enterprise.

Third I am concerned about a new kind of stratification emerging in our society. One aspect is ecological and the other educational in character. The ecological is contained in the growing social class differentiation in the developing patterns of metropolitan residential living. More and more metropolitan areas are becoming little homogeneous islands of like level people ranging from slum to suburb. Going are the days when people of all social classes lived within the radius of a few miles and when the children of all class levels attended the same elementary and high school.

Continuing the educational aspect, if we start with the drop out and continue with the graduate of the high school, college and professional school, we encounter one kind of hierarchy. Or, if we begin with the graduate of a community college, continue successively with teachers colleges, the municipal college, small denominational colleges to the prestigious ivy league colleges and universities we have another hierarchy.

The relevance of these facts for our theme of stratification becomes clear when we confront the almost one to one relationship between the level of learning and the point of entry and advance in the major life chances of society. In our status conscious, success worshipping social order, the message is coming through strong and clear. We must learn, keep on learning or perish. This is the awesome fact of our times. But the unexpected and too often unacknowledged consequence of this fact is the gradual creation of a new form of stratification which if misunderstood and unchecked, could produce serious consequences for the well being of society. In the U.S.A. we have been proud of the relative fluid and open character of our social structure. The new fact is that it is open more and more to those who are educated, and almost completely closed to those who are under educated.

Adult education can make a major contribution to correcting this situation. It can provide a point of re-entry and advance at any point in the life cycle. No level of formal schooling need be regarded as the level determining the ultimate status of the individual. This can be corrected at any moment the person is ready and able to engage in systematic instruction. Adult education can and should be the gate to keeping the structure of society loose and open.

My fourth concern may be simply stated as that of achieving and maintaining a sense of "unum" in the midst of growing "pluribus." Again we select a much rehearsed dilemma of the American scene and one highly representative of the contradictions characteristic of our life. We appear to be developing a homogenized, mass culture on the one hand in the midst of some deeply rooted ideological class and racial cleavages on the other. In function and in fact we are highly interdependent but we have no corresponding internalized commitment to that fact. The answer lies at several levels and in various departments. In the field of organization it means the humanization of bureaucracy and the encouragement of informal along side formal systems. In the realm of values it means the enrichment and reinforcement of our belief in the dignity of man, in our commitment to a sense of fair play, and the democratic process of problem solving. And in education it means a more explicit attention to the development of a sense of community as a goal of instruction. In all these respects the franchise for the adult educator is impressive.

The foregoing critique makes no pretense of being a definitive or inclusive assessment of the current social scene. It is offered as illustrative of some of the areas of concern wherein the adult educator in higher education must operate. You can draw up your own inventory, and formulate your own criteria, but whatever scheme you devise both the society and the domain of higher education will more and more require a high order of educational statesmanship in the fulfillment of the new franchise herein implied.

Role of Adult Educator

Before indicating more explicitly what this franchise might entail, let us confront some of the realities with which average adult educators in higher education must deal. To do so we must first of all remember the intermediate position he occupies between the academic center of his host institution on the one hand, and the client in the community outside the institution on the other hand. Typically a large part of his program or operation is a merged response to the offerings of the one and the requests of the other. In this role of broker, or mediator, if not arbitrator and negotiator, the adult educator in higher education may not perceive himself as having much leeway to adventure, and explore new territory. This broker or mediating role will of necessity always be a major feature of his program.

But if we accept the two general points I have tried to make, . . . the role of the adult educator in higher education must be much more creative and innovative than the traditional role of broker has permitted him to be. True we may use lack of resource as justification if not explanation for sticking with the traditional role. But we cannot use lack of resource as an excuse for failing to envisage the job of adult educator in dimensions required by the society, and for which facilities and talent are rapidly becoming available. Perhaps a fresh perspective on the new franchise and a willingness to take risks in venturing new paths could attract resources.

In fact I believe it can be argued that there has never been a time more ripe for the invention of new programs, projects, formats, devices, facilities, than at the present time. Whatever one thinks of the programs of the office of economic opportunity, or the beginnings of the work of Title I, the fact remains that these and similar ventures have created a ferment, sensitivity and readiness for change never known at any earlier time in our history. At all levels the last decade has been the most exciting, venturesome, creative, provocative period in the history of American education, and of all levels the domain of adult education has been as exciting as any. The next decade should be even more so. The need for innovation and creation of new patterns of education is so great that there is some question as to whether the existing establishment can and will move rapidly enough to accommodate the needs now being generated. This is, among other things the significance of the expanding entrance of the private sector into the field of education. And the growing partnership of the government with the private sector could be one way, which either by accident or design, new institutional forms will be created, or basic changes within the structure of existing institutional forms will be shaped. The need is here, the talent and facilities are here, resources are here. It is a question as to whether the adult educator in the existing establishment will and can take hold in a fashion sufficiently creative to produce an effective response.

At the risk of neglecting operational details let me suggest some roles which if activated could contribute to such a response. . . . The adult educator would be analyst, spotter and anticipator of trends which if extrapolated would without control, diversion or restraint, present problems of critical dimensions to the society. Second, in his role as social analyst he would scan the scene for bipolarities, or tensions, and arrange for bringing them to light and in dialogue. Third, continuing his role as analyst and programmer he would also scan the scene for orbits within the society which fail habitually to intersect, and if possible bring them together in communication. At this point he would be the arranger of communication. Next he would spot the class and racial cleavages of the society, and in advance of overheated crisis promote analysis of issues and association of leaders. He would in effect convene the dialectic. Next and overlapping, he would map the leadership grid of the community and assess the role of its members as potential allies in his efforts at education.

In effect he would arrange the social audit.

For the more conventional course program through processes of counseling and interpretation of data which such processes would yield, he would discover new patterns of need for instruction, both credit and noncredit, and in collaboration with his colleagues in the disciplines, find new teaching formats and content with which to meet their needs. He would be aware of and cooperate with other agencies of adult education in the communities and the larger region of which they are a part, in fact he would conceive of the communities themselves as educative and agents of education. He would assume that among his colleagues he is not alone in his concern for the educational wellbeing of the community. He would seek out and encourage his colleagues to join the adventure with him. At the same time, he would assume that among the knowledgeable and thoughtful leaders of the community outside the university there are also persons who share his concerns. He would encourage and mobilize each group either unilaterally or at times in combination to share the adventure of meeting the demands of the society. And for this purpose he would set aside some risk funds, 5% of his budget, for innovation, demonstration, and experimentation to test and evaluate existing procedures and try out new ones.

In my judgment there are now more forces favoring the kind of trend I am suggesting than many of us realize. In our favor there is first of all a growing recognition of the increasingly important role of higher education and especially the university in our society. . . . Let us attempt to forecast the direction which the institutional response to the demands for adult education will take.

First let us assume that these demands are legitimate and can no longer be ignored. It is my prediction, that the extension service or its equivalent will be the arm of the university through which this response will best be made. I believe that the cooperation and contribution of the disciplines will always be important, indeed, indispensable. But in my judgment the organization and dynamics of the disciplines do not permit the development of the kind of program necessary to make the response which will be needed. The needs of the society are cross or inter disciplinary in character and their unit of manifestation is usually a problem. As we all know, problem areas have always been difficult for higher education to institutionalize. Institutes and centers for area studies are examples of new administrative attempts to deal with new forms of academic inquiry. But even these are not problem centered in the manner which society expresses. Again the kind of response I envisage will require skills of procedure, methods and programming uniquely adapted to the adult client. Again these are elements largely foreign to the interest, skills and competencies of disciplines, departments, centers and institutes. The character of the societal demand on the one hand, and the administrative traditions and habits of the universities on the other, point to the extension service as logical vehicle through which an appropriate response will be effected.

In conclusion, there is another factor which I predict will affect the response in this field. I believe that the problems and needs we are discussing are so urgent, massive and common, that institutions of higher learning will be compelled more and more to pool their resources in a collaborative effort to meet them. In other words, I believe some application of systems theory to a regional linkage of higher education in the domain of adult education is not only feasible, but necessary. I think the time will come and come soon, when we will regard the institutions of higher learning as regional centers for community and educational improvement. Because of the nearness of extension divisions to the market, they would be the logical arm by which a systematic approach to the education of adults would be achieved.

I make no prediction as to the timing and schedule of this development, but I believe it will come and that we already have evidence that it is on its way. At any rate, the need is there. Higher education has part of the answer and it will be compelled to make its share of the response.

THIRD GENERAL SESSION

MONDAY, APRIL 24

THE REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

By Charles F. Milner

In my opening remarks at Albuquerque last July, I used the Spanish work, "Adelante," meaning forward, let's go.

At this time of summing up for this administration, it is fitting and proper that we examine the record of what has been accomplished.

The opening of the Washington office just one year ago was a long sought goal. It was to give us a better opportunity to deal with emerging problems and opportunities at the national level and to review our internal associational activities more systematically with the assistance of the full-time staff.

The achievements of the association with the assistance of a Washington office can be measured in terms of the state of our finances, the development of meaningful programs, and improvement in institutional arrangements.

We all know that the financial statement is a good indicator of the health of any organization. Ten years ago our budget amounted to $11,500. Our surplus at the end of the fiscal year amounted to $15,600. Over the years since then, our budgets seldom exceeded $20,000, including income from the annual meeting.

Under the dynamic leadership of my predecessors with the full support and cooperation of the member institutions, a dramatic change in our financial situation took place. In fiscal 1966, the financial statement showed income of $71,000 in the general fund and $5,910,000 in the special Project Head Start account. At the end of that year, our fund balance amounted to $52,300.

At the beginning of fiscal year 1966-67, with the opening of the Washington office, our budget called for a projected deficit of $15,000 which was part of our risk in opening that office. We are pleased to report that on the latest fiscal statement for the year ending March 31, 1967, the $15,000 projected deficit was converted into a surplus of $18,300. Our combined assets amounted to $81,800 and our fund balance amounted to $68,000.

We moved into the new fiscal year in the healthiest financial condition this association has ever enjoyed.

As we look ahead, the budget calls for a sharp increase in funds for divisions, as well as the inclusion of funds for sections for the first time. The association for the first time is giving recognition to the increasing financial burden upon the institution at which the president of the association serves. Modest funds have been authorized for travel and telephone expenses. If recent expenditures for the office of the president were to continue, it is clear that candidates to the presidency would be increasingly restricted to the representatives of the largest and wealthiest member institutions.

Next, let's look at program development. During the last fiscal year, the Community Development Division took the leadership in negotiating a grant from Sears Roebuck Foundation to finance a conference to review the division's plans and programs and its relationship with the Washington office.

Last June the association received a grant of $1,055,000 from the Office of Education for the Adult Basic Education Teacher Training Program which was recently extended for an additional year with a budget of $1,400,000. The new grant increased the number of participant institutes from nine to eighteen and introduced a significant innovation. Nine of the participating institutes will be funded for an extra $22,500 each to employ a full-time, year-round university staff specialist in adult education.

We are also proud to note that the staff of the Washington office, working with the staff of the Office of Education developed for this project the model for an accelerated national teacher training program. We expect this to be an important contribution to the educational system of this country.

On the horizon is a national training program for a nationwide industrial group. While this program has been developing, we have received encouraging responses from deans and directors regarding the desirability of working with private groups to develop national programs to satisfy their education and training needs.

During the past year we also worked on development of a proposal to the Kellogg Foundation for technical assistance to community and developing institution and to our own members in educational technology. While this proposal has not been finalized, we expect it to be ready for submission in the near future.

On a less optimistic note, it is necessary to report that we submitted a proposal once again on the Head Start contract for this year and were discouraged to discover that an unknown profit-making corporation, Volt Technical Corporation, was awarded the contract.

As most of you know, Title I faced its severest crisis last summer and fall when it appeared that the appropriation for the program would be eliminated by the Senate. This unexpected development provided us with an opportunity to demonstrate our concern for the program as well as our strength as an association. Under the strong leadership of the chairman of the Governmental Relations Committee, most of you responded to the call for support, and within a very short period of time, the tide was reversed and the appropriation was restored.

The significance of this action for the future should not be under estimated. We demonstrated a capability for action which was never demonstrated as clearly and with such impact before.

Internally, several important organizational changes were made. Several committees and sections were added or reorganized. At the request of the executive director, the board approved the reestablishment of the NUEA Management Center in Silver Spring, Maryland, to carry out national projects funded through NUEA. This move will enable the Washington office staff to devote its full time to promoting new programs and using association resources to service all member institutions whether or not they are participating in special projects.

In the past year another significant step was made when six regional groupings of states were established as proposed by the Sherburne Committee. It is my hope that this structure will receive final approval at this conference.

Furthering this structure, we inaugurated area meetings of deans and directors at five locations last month. In spite of extremely short notice, attendance at these meetings was good, and the exchange of information and ideas was valuable to all concerned.

As a final item in this story of growth, we are especially proud to note that 14 institutions formally applied for membership in the nine brief months since the last annual meeting. This is the largest number of applications ever received in this period of time since the founding of the association.

So much for the record of accomplishments and activities. What are our problems and what can we look forward to in the future? If it is true that higher adult education is just entering its golden era, then our number one problem is recruitment and training of sufficient, first-rate professional and paraprofessional staff to cope with the problems of growth and expansion. Many of you have become aware of the proposed federal Education Professions Development Act which will go a long way toward solving this problem, but we must also strengthen our Professional Development Section to plan for and resolve this on-going problem.

Internally, we must examine and re-examine our organizational structure and membership patterns. How open should our membership be? Our present charter has an open door for all institutions of higher education who meet the specific criteria for membership. Should the charter be amended to restrict membership to institutions with complex organizational and program needs, or should NUEA reorganize internally to satisfy the different needs of many types of institutions of higher education? Is there room enough in NUEA to accommodate the highly complex larger state and private universities as well as the more homogeneous single college institutions?

In the same vein, should membership in the association be permanent, or should the institutional qualifications be reviewed periodically? A hard look must also be given at our divisional and sectional structure. Have conditions changed sufficiently to give increasing attention and resources to some activities and less to others? Allow me to emphasize that at this stage, I am asking questions and not promising final answers. It does seem, however, that these questions must be explored carefully and in a systematic way by an appropriate body of this organization, and I have proposed that a committee be directed to give recommendations to the membership after a careful review of all the facts.

Within our own institutions, we must reexamine the meaning of "general extension," at least as it relates to membership in NUEA. In some of our institutions, all of the extension and continuing education programs are unified within a single division under a single administrator. General extension in these institutions is catholic in application. Their membership covers all extension activities by all persons engaged in extension and continuing education work on these campuses. In other institutions, extension and continuing education are highly decentralized. General extension in these institutions retains the traditional connotation. Medical extension, engineering extension, pharmaceutical extension, agricultural extension, technical and other extension activities are separately organized and administered. The staffs of these campus divisions cannot participate in NUEA programs even though their institutions hold membership in the association. In other institutions, evening college work is separated administratively from conferences and institutes. Here too, membership in some institutions reflects only one segment of the general extension program on the campus.

Should we follow the traditional policy of allowing each institution to decide for itself how broad its membership base should be, or should we establish a requirement that institutional membership cover all of the extension and continuing education programs on a campus?

Permit me to turn to the Washington scene again. We have been aware for several years of increasing Congressional attention to national education and training needs. Virtually every federal agency is actively administering one or more major training programs. Many are in-service programs applying to employees or dependents of employees. Others, which concern us vitally, are programs intended for persons outside the federal establishment such as in police administration, Head Start training, Adult Basic Education and general teacher education (to name but a few).

Who is to administer these programs? How are they to be organized? What kind of responsibilities do educational institutions assume when they participate in these programs. What kind of curriculum controls, if any, should Congress and federal agencies impose upon operating institutions? To what extent can curricula be nationalized without interfering with the academic privileges of institutions of higher education and their faculties.

The use of private nonprofit and proprietary organizations for development of national programs, whether publicly or privately financed—and I repeat, whether publicly or privately financed—has increased. If it does truly represent a new educational form, it deserves our most careful attention and consideration. It is patently clear that there is a truly significant difference between the administration and management of a national educational program by an organization of institutions of higher education, such as the NUEA, and an organization in which our institutions of higher education have no voice and over which they exercise no control. This is one of the most crucial problems we face right now and perhaps for the next 20 years. Should we, as an association of independent institutions of higher education, insist that our voice be officially and formally represented in the administration of national education programs, or will we find it acceptable to allow corporations, government agencies and other organizations to dictate the curricula, the administrative systems and logistic requirements of programs which we have traditionally operated in accordance with our own campus policies and procedures?

In resolving the emerging conflict between nonprofit institutions of higher education and proprietary corporations, our ultimate posture must be to make the country aware that we cannot accept a competitive position under law when corporations engaging in highly profitable manufacturing or other activities have millions of dollars to pour into staff development, facilities and equipment in contrast to the meager funds available for programs in our institutions of higher education.

Similarly, we must insist that when public funds are used for the financing of higher adult education, such education must be financed at the lowest cost to the public rather than at the highest cost. When corporations are not only provided with all direct costs but also overhead rates of 100 to 150 per cent plus normal profit margins, we can hardly expect to compete with them.

Should corporations develop higher quality education at lower cost, we can hardly cry "unfair." But, if our legislators are persuaded to pay significantly more to corporations for the same educational product than we are expected to deliver, surely we must raise the most serious questions of equity.

Most of these problems could be resolved if we understood that our nonprofit educational institutions and corporate enterprises have a mutual need for each other. Our guidelines for this resolution may well be as follows: We, as educational institutions, must concede to corporate enterprises the general right to produce educational hardware of all types for use in our school systems at every level. We must, on the other hand, demand that all public funds for instruction be channeled through nonprofit institutions. And finally, we should concede that software remains a gray area open to whomever can do the best job, and, to the extent that public funds are used for software, our legislatures must provide such funds solely on an equitable basis without price differential for nonprofit and proprietary organizations.

The task before us to eliminate the squabbling among those who can contribute to the quality and quantity of the educational product we all desire.

We have witnessed not only this challenge to our institutions and our professional association. We have also seen competing, overlapping, jurisdictions and, on occasion, the development of inter-associational jealousies. I offer no simple solutions. Nevertheless, as federal programs increase in size and we and other national associations become more actively involved in administering these programs, we may well find that inter-associational disputes may seriously mar the image and effectiveness of all adult education.

I believe I speak for the officers, the board, the member institutions of this association and the staff of the Washington office when I say that the National University Extension Association is now and will continue to be open to all efforts to combine our resources, our efforts and our organization in any way that will enable any proper combination of professional associations to serve best in the national interest.

I would like to offer several guidelines for our future course.

The first guideline is that initial steps be taken by this and similar associations of institutions of higher education to combine their resources in whatever way is mutually acceptable. At the same time, associations which primarily represent individuals follow similar procedures. It is unrealistic at this time for us to struggle with the problems of combining associations representing such different membership bases.

This does not in any way imply that previous and present efforts to coordinate the work of all professional associations in adult education should not continue with increased vigor. We have demonstrated that associations having an institutional membership base can represent, speak on behalf of, and act for member institutions of higher education in accordance with association regulations and limitations. It may be that at some time in the future, one large association can be organized to represent institutions and individuals.

I offer no closed door; rather, I offer two open doors for the short run, with the suggestion that we make a further review after consolidation has taken place within these two structures.

I suggest a second guideline to insure that emerging educational forms at the national level protect our vital interests. We must establish a policy that these organizations and associations engage only in activities which no single member institution can or will do by itself.

I suggest further that our institutions operating through their associations adopt a policy which requires that whatever national curricular needs there may be (and we should have no concerns about recognizing the existence of national education training needs which are truly nation-wide), must be implemented through curriculum designs covering broad subject matter areas, and that such curricula have built in allowances for adjustment to meet local, regional and state variations in needs.

I will note one final problem. The great society is largely a massive educational program aimed at providing all persons, not only with equal opportunity for education in childhood, but also with opportunities for life-long learning to meet personal, economic and social needs of an increasingly complex society. Politically, programs are often created in response to pressures arising from obvious needs among segments of our population. Politically, once action is initiated and money is appropriated, instant solutions are demanded. As a result, inadequate or no preparation is made, and results are sought without regard to the scope or the depth of the problem. In effect, instant education is demanded.

We know there is no such thing as instant education. The time has come for all of us to tell the public and our political leaders the fundamental facts of education. If we do not, much of the great work which has been done will be wasted, and education will receive a serious setback.

As a final word, I urge you to support our next president, and the new board of directors as energetically and loyally as you have supported me and the board of directors with whom I have had the honor and privilege of working.

FOURTH GENERAL SESSION

TUESDAY, APRIL 25

CALL TO COOPERATION

By Alan MacCarthy
University of Michigan
Past President, American Alumni Council

As Dean Eklund has indicated in his introductory remarks, the American Alumni Council and the National University Extension Association have been working together intensively over the past two to three years through the liaison committees each organization has appointed. The leadership of the council has been particularly concerned with the stimulation of a broad interest throughout its membership in serving the educational needs of its constituency—the 20 million alumni of American colleges and universities. Actually the council has been working at this sporadically for a period of at least a decade, as my later remarks will document. But it has not been until recently—through the joint work of our liaison committees—that a more logical and effective method for this undertaking truly revealed itself.

In this process, we in the council have been diligently studying the field in which you extension people perform in such an exemplary way. It will come as no surprise then, I am sure, that through pursuit of our own continuing education into the fertile field of alumni continuing education the principles and philosophy which have emerged, and have been made apparent to us, bear perhaps more than a coincidental similarly to the fundamental convictions and commitments of the National University Extension Association itself.

We have come to recognize that the burgeoning interest in adult or continuing education is one of the most important phenomena of our times as millions of adult Americans are participating in educational experiences of all levels and subject matter. We see this as possibly a belated response to the numerous technological breakthroughs and intellectual ferment of recent decades in which the rate of knowledge has multiplied in geometric proportions.

Consequently, the continuance of one's education has become a recognized necessity. Jobs and professional skills are becoming obsolete even as they are being taught; principles once considered timeless are frequently superseded and the technologist in this cybernetical age is finding that he must expect, and qualify himself for, five to ten job changes during his professional career. At the same time, his equally important roles as parent and responsible citizen are imposing other exacting demands upon him.

In short, the explosion of technical knowledge and the proliferation of world problems—social, economic, and political—make the process of continuing education not only essential to man's progress, but even to his very survival.

For these and related reasons, we recognize along with you that higher education curricula are moving away from applied learning in favor of an emphasis on imparting to students the curiosity and the tools by which they will continue throughout their lives to seek and learn new knowledge as it inevitably continues to be discovered in every field of human endeavor.

In light of these facts, universities and colleges must then face up to these consequential questions:

Does responsibility to their students stop with graduation?

As the last step in the formal academic hierarchy, do universities not have responsibility to provide form and means for the continuing education of at least their alumni, if not society as a whole?

The institutions that make up the American Alumni Council represent over 20 million alumni. You might well ask: what is the council doing to develop the *opportunity* to serve these people in a way that can affect their individual lives in a significant and lasting manner?

In 1958, the American Alumni Council called a conference at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, D. C. to consider the status of continuing education programs. Out of that conference came a report from which I quote:

> "This conference affirms that continuing education of the adult is the major responsibility of this nation's colleges and universities, and that each institution must accept an obligation for continuing education of its alumni as a vital part of that responsibility.
>
> "This conference calls upon the administration and faculties of the colleges and universities, upon their alumni associations, and upon the individual alumni of the nation to recognize this responsibility in their purpose and action.
>
> "This conference recommends that the nation's colleges and universities engage in programs of continuing education for their alumni, considering these programs as part of a long range commitment that begins with a student on the campus.
>
> "The conference asserts its convictions that programs of continuing education developed for alumni be characterized by the same seriousness of intent, purpose, and quality in contents and performance, that are found in the regular curricula.
>
> "This conference believes that the curriculum and its teaching should be designed to further the desire for, and the purpose of, continuous education."

Please remember this is the council speaking almost ten years ago.

Since the Shoreham Conference, fragmented and often disjointed programs of continuing education for alumni have become a major concern of many colleges and universities that comprise the council membership. However, we have been painfully aware that our efforts, though in some instances quite commendable, have been for the most part — and relative to our fantastic potential — less than overwhelmingly successful. Together, ladies and gentlemen, I think both we of the American Alumni Council, and you of the National University Extension Association, have been derelict in not meeting more effectively this opportunity and this obligation.

A committee of the council—upon which, as you know, the NUEA has been represented by Lowell Eklund, who is also a member of the council — has been over the past year and a half meeting quietly to determine directions for more concerted efforts. This committee very recently proposed a new statement of purpose which was approved by the board of directors of the American Alumni Council at its mid-winter meeting at Washington, in February, 1967.

Building on the Shoreham Conference, this statement of purpose declares in part ". . . that while continuing education is a single concept . . . implementation must be flexible and comprehensive. There are three guides which should apply in most cases:

> (a) the responsibility for program content should be primarily with the academicians;
>
> (b) since alumni are the constituents for these programs, the alumni administrators have a key role of providing continuing education opportunities because of their intimate knowledge of the *needs* of alumni and their ability to promote programs *designed* for alumni;
>
> (c) the American Alumni Council as a coordinating agency and its members individually have a unique opportunity to promulgate awareness of the need and advantages of alumni continuing education and the availability of programs addressed to this objective."

The statement of purpose in this report summarizes our conviction by saying:

> "We support individual or collective interaction with other interested organizations (namely, the National University Extension Association, the Association of University Evening Colleges, and such agencies as the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults) and we encourage inter-institutional and regional coordination to:
>
> 1. Develop a coordinated effort.
> 2. Define various programs that are available.
> 3. Create new programs.
> 4. Create cooperative localized programs to utilize institutional resources for extra-institutional clientele.
> 5. Apply essential administrative and faculty resources to create continuing education programs.
> 6. Offer programs requiring different content, time, cost, and logistics (to meet the needs of alumni).
>
> "Above all, we feel that any effective and vigorous program, no matter what its sponsorship, which is dedicated to the continuing education of any of the 20 million alumni will promote a vital relationship between colleges and universities and their alumni."

Now where do we go from here? Those we of the council represent, offer tremendous potential as a market (if you please) for programs of continuing education. Many of us recognize that perhaps none of the responsibilities facing us as alumni administrators offers the potential of gain for the individual alumnus, or for the institution, as that which can be realized through programs of continuing education. The alumni administrator has a unique opportunity to marshal the appropriate institutional elements behind alumni education efforts.

But an effective linking with those other arms of our institutions is needed. While the alumni administrator is privy to these vast resources of human potential, other agencies must be allied to properly design and administer programs for the benefit of these human resources.

We believe (and your spokesmen, Charles Milner and Lowell Eklund have helped convince us) that wherever an extension, an evening college, or continuing education agency is available, it should be called upon to provide program design and administration for the alumni education project, with the alumni officer serving as the principal contact, catalyst, and promotional channel. The established and traditional status of the alumni administrator in relationship to the alumni should enhance the impact and facilitate the "marketing" of alumni educational program offerings to members of the individual association.

Also, the alumni administrator's close and continuing contact with alumni should enable him to assess accurately the educational needs of alumni, to represent these to the continuing education agency, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the program offered.

Already there are small beginnings in the area of inter-institutional cooperation and reciprocity which may be the key to future successful programs of continuing education. It would seem feasible and desirable to suggest that on a nationwide basis colleges and universities unite in working arrangements whereby distant alumni may be integrated into local programs of other universities much as undergraduates currently transfer from one institution to another. We must find appropriate sources of education at locations that are accessible and, therefore, inter-institutional cooperation and reciprocity may be the key to the future success of such a program.

Now for some firm recommendations. It appears that with the assistance and support of the National University Extension Association, the American Alumni Council has a unique and distinct opportunity to offer a far greater variety of programs. For this reason we recommend that a pilot project be developed immediately whereby the NUEA and the AAC could join forces to service the educational needs of millions of our alumni. It would seem that private foundation and federal monies might well be attracted to experimentation in and the seeding of such a broad scale effort jointly sponsored by two such major and respected associations.

In this process, might it not be possible for the NUEA and the AAC, working jointly, to organize a series of regional workshops for those alumni administrators and institutional representatives responsible for alumni educational programs. These workshops should provide the philosophical background and theory of adult and continuing education; but most important, they would give alumni administrators methods of program organization and operation. This is the critical need. You represent the reservoir of expertise to effectively meet this need. Will you join with us?

We of the American Alumni Council can think of no expenditure of effort that has greater long range potential benefit than programs of continuing education. We are convinced that the pursuit of excellence by 20 million alumni of our colleges and universities through continuing education is not only desirable, but mandatory. The dynamics of society dictate not only a basic education, but demand a constant upgrading and re-education of the educated in order to meet the spiraling requirements of technical and social leadership.

Our alumni are an identifiable and accessible audience for continuing programs of education. They represent a tremendous human resource that you can help to develop.

We stand ready to work with you in furthering our common objective by serving educationally the most advantaged, enlightened, potent segment of our society.

We need and seek your help; we think we may also serve your interests in the process. This, then, is our call to the National University Extension Association; *our call to cooperation.* We, of the American Alumni Council, hope you will accept.

CONTINUING EDUCATION — OUR MUTUAL CONCERN

By The Honorable Jack Miller
U.S. Senator from Iowa

Novelist Thomas Wolfe once wrote:

"So, then, to every man his chance—to every man regardless of his birth, his shining, golden opportunity—to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself, and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him—this seeker, is the promise of America."

I can think of no other quotation which is more applicable today to the program of adult education on the American scene.

For a citizen of this great nation today, the promise of America is encompassed in the development of the human resource through education. The shaper of our environment is man, who unquestionably must seek to serve the unlimited goals of the human spirit.

Education today is the key, the essential prerequisite, to economic and social progress of the United States.

Therein lies the rationale for Congressional enactment in the past few years of some of the most progressive education legislation in history—legislation covering the entire spectrum from preschool through graduate school, to the awakening of our dormant human resources in adult education programs.

Because of the recognition that we must tap the whole man through educational development and the progress we are making toward this goal, other nations—especially those of Europe—are observing more and more a widening technological gap between their economies and those of the United States.

But the European fails to appreciate that the reasons for America's growing lead are complex and many, including more than the nature of this nation's internal market and our attitude toward technological innovation, consumption and plant investment. They fail to realize that high among the complex of reasons lies this nation's commitment to ever-broadening educational opportunity.

This is not to deny that our educational systems harbor shortcomings. But all the evidence indicates significant progress in recent years.

While the education of its children and youth is of paramount importance in the nation's technological and social progress, this alone is insufficient to explain the levels of U.S. achievement. The nation's breakthroughs in space exploration and nuclear energy, its advances in health, and its advances in the social sciences are due in significant measure to an enlightened view of education, including vocational and occupational training, as a lifelong process. Since World War II, adult and continuing education have grown at a rate unknown in any other nation. And although inadequate public recognition has been given its growth and development, the continuing education effort of this nation is second in the rate of participation only to its elementary and secondary education effort.

Adult education in America has really never been mere citizenship education for immigrants newly arrived upon these shores. It has included the Chautauqua Movement, starting in the 1870s; and, with the establishment of the Land Grant Colleges after passage of the George Morrill Act of 1862, it has included cooperative extension, which blossomed into the Federal Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture. It has also, of course, included adult vocational education.

Today, adult or continuing education includes rapidly expanding university extension programs, manpower training, adult basic education, public school extension, independent study and correspondence, formal on-the-job training, adult high school, religious education, professional seminars, and a host of other learning activities involving the adult population of the nation.

At least 25 million American adults annually take part in some kind of structured continuing education activity. The participants include all income levels and practically all ages.

Although some administration officials are calling for renewal of higher education through special college level arrangements for persons over 60, typically, the adult participating in continuing education is under 40, white collar, a suburbanite and middle income. But the emphasis upon manpower development and the welfare of the disadvantaged is bringing more of the poor into the educational stream through adult education.

It is reported that fewer than a fifth of Americans who take part in continuing education do so for college credit or to obtain high school diplomas. This nation can be proud that so many of its adult population studies or takes part in education activities because they want to learn. The largest single group taking part in adult education does so for a reason entirely consistent with the American tradition of personal advancement on the job through extra individual effort. This group represents approximately one-third of those participating in adult education, and its motivation is improved professional, agricultural, or nonprofessional occupational competence, to learn a new trade or for related economic reasons. The second largest group is engaged in education activity as a hobby or form of recreation, as might be expected in a nation which seeks the fruitful use of leisure time. Other major reasons for participation includes self-improvement through general education, spiritual and religious learning and development, the desire to become better husbands and wives and parents, and keeping abreast of public affairs.

University extension is carried on in most tax-supported institutions of higher education and in many private institutions. Enrollments continue to grow and figures in my own state of Iowa are typical. The University of Iowa, during the school year 1965-66, enrolled 3,377 students through extension classes for college credit. In many states, cooperative and university extension have been combined or are operating closely together. Extension offers study for credit or non-credit within the university complex itself, independent study and correspondence. It is unique in that it can marshal resources from not only the entire university but from outside as well.

The federal government today supports a great variety of adult educational programs. Out of the understanding of the role of education in combatting poverty, added emphasis is being placed on adult education at the basic and remedial levels, and the national commitment to meeting this need was spelled out in the Adult Basic Education Act of 1966.

The Manpower Development and Training Act represents an upgrading effort of great potential in adult education and training. By the end of 1966, training opportunities had been approved under this act for 838,000 persons since the beginning of the program in August 1962. Of this number, over 567,000 had been authorized for institutional training and 270,000 for on-the-job training. By the end of 1966, 337,000 had completed their scheduled course and roughly four-fifths of these MDTA "graduates" were employed at the time of last contact with them. As of last December, there were 98,000 persons training under the program.

Federal support of institutes through NDEA means new breakthroughs in education.

In-house training dedicated to the missions of the various federal agencies concerned is an obvious and essential activity. I myself took some courses in advanced tax accounting when I served in the Chief Counsel's Office of the Internal Revenue Service, and these courses had been devised and programmed for many years by the Treasury Department and are still being given.

The armed services conduct the largest and one of the finest independent-correspondence study programs.

Cooperative extension and other programs of the Department of Agriculture now reach the urban, as well as the rural population.

The President's recent message on Education and Health in America called for expenditures of $763 million to train 224,000 health workers in fiscal 1968 to meet the nation's health manpower needs. Enactment of the Medicare and Medicaid programs found us in such a short supply of health personnel that we cannot meet the requirements of these programs.

Recent studies show that some 44 programs, many involving universities, called for expenditures of more than $1.4 billion for federally aided adult education activities.

Studies conducted by the National Association of Public School Educators three years ago obtained information on programs offered by 480 public schools in nearly every state. Projections based on this information indicate that there were then 110,000 part-time and 7,600 full-time adult educators within the public schools. Earlier statistics compiled from an Office of Education study disclosed that some two million adult students enrolled in adult public elementary and high school courses. Despite increasing stress on basic education for the 25 million Americans with below eighth-grade literacy levels, the great majority was enrolled at the high school level, chiefly in vocational courses or in high-school diploma or equivalency courses. While the importance of vocational and academic high-school adult education cannot be over-stressed, the nation's continuing serious poverty problem and its still appallingly high adult illiteracy rate suggest greater support for adult basic education.

Industry has stated, with good reason, that the nation's greatest occupational training ground is the industrial or business establishment. Most of American industry has learned that investment in training and occupational education is as important as plant investment. And the reason is clear: It does little good to invest in computers or other sophisticated devices unless a skilled work-force is available to operate them. A 1963 Department of Labor survey revealed that nearly 1.5 million workers engaged in formal programs within industry—and I am certain it is much higher today. Many non-employees take part in business-sponsored education activities, such as conferences and workshops.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce claims that between 80 and 90 per cent of all vocational and technical training is supported by business and industry, and that some 32,000 private trade and technical schools provide technical and occupational training with support from the private sector.

The major portion of vocational training is on-the-job training. Smaller enterprises often cannot afford such training, and many suffer serious problems as a result of an inadequately trained labor force. The federally supported on-the-job training program, which includes reimbursement to employers for added training expenses, represents a significant, although limited, step forward in this area.

Speaking of computers, I am not sure whether this will be called by historians "the computer age," but all of us know that it is an age of increasing automation. From the standpoint of a Member of Congress, I am not too much interested in the definition of automation, nor in the loose commingling of the concept of automation with technology, mechanization, and economic change. I am concerned about unemployment, and particularly concerned over the means available for the federal government to do something about it. The harsh social consequences for the individuals and families affected are bad enough; the debilitating effects on the moral fibre of our nation and the waste of our country's productivity from unemployment are even worse.

Professor Charles Killingsworth of Michigan State University makes the point that it is a major source of error to assume that the markets of our mass-production industries will grow at the same prodigious rate in the second half of this century that they achieved in the first half; and that without such a growth rate, the doctrine that "machines make jobs" will be invalid. Thus, he says, when a major labor-saving invention is introduced in an industry which is in its rapid growth stage, the invention may help spur further rapid growth, especially through price cuts, and total employment in the industry may increase substantially. But the fact is that when an industry reaches maturity, it is just not possible to achieve further dramatic increases in sales, even with large price cuts. Under such circumstances, the improved productivity made possible by labor-saving machines simply enables the industry to keep up with the normal growth of the market while employing fewer production workers. This is what happened to a number of major industries in the 1950s, such as coal, and it should serve as a warning that continued automation will likely bring about an even greater need for adult retraining and education to avoid unemployment.

Education today has become a major industry. It could be said that it is a "growth" industry—since the $4 billion we spent on it at the end of World War II has grown to over $50 billion today. As a result, private industry increasingly depends upon it to insure future prosperity through a better educated work-force, and as a market for its know-how. Generally speaking, the new private sector initiatives have come in the formal elementary and secondary and higher education areas. But private enterprise has demonstrated its education and training abilities in many areas and has provided experts for university extension and other adult education activity.

The new technology developed by private industry may have significant application in adult education but needed funds to determine its worth are often lacking. Under some circumstances, the Manpower Development and Training Act now employs the know-how of private proprietary schools. There is a need to use private industry in greater measure within the massive adult education effort which the nation's changing technology and life patterns is demanding; and this calls for study and innovation both from industry and educators.

Despite its massive proportions, adult and continuing education continues to be the step-child of the education system. In most institutions of high education, extension alone is called upon to be self-supporting. This prevents the admission of many low-income adults who would seek self-improvement through university extension if they could afford to do so. Extension is an area in which there are few, if any, scholarships. Even within the public school system, extension comes last since the education of the children must be the first concern. Adult education also suffers from an insufficient number of trained educators, inadequate information regarding opportunities, duplication of federal efforts, and state and local neglect, as well as financial malnutrition. The Foundations which stress educational achievement have tended to overlook the adult education area. There is need for Congressional study to determine how best to recruit and train the adult educators the nation needs, how to harness the know-how of the private sector to the broader adult education needs beyond the individual establishment or company, and how best to encourage greater public and private support to the continuing education effort.

Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 will play an increasingly important part in the whole gamut of adult education. University extension educators have informed me that it is creating a new spirit of cooperation among universities in their states. Title I grants are dedicated to harnessing the resources of the university for community service at the problem-solving level through extension. Such grants, although relatively modest, can and are being employed to improve adult education opportunities, particularly for the disadvantaged. Title I moves forward in the entire field of adult and continuing education through its National Advisory Committee which is mandated to review, recommend and report on progress and problems. The committee has already undertaken to compile an inventory of federally supported programs with a view to establishing better coordination and eliminating duplication. While the Title I appropriation is small by present-day standards, its programs have important implications for improvements in adult and continuing education.

Just as there is need for innovation in elementary and secondary education and in higher education for our youth, so is there a need for new approaches to adult and continuing education. The nation needs more programs of independent study which, combined with short residency on the campus, will result in degrees. There is a need to find ways to incorporate past university-level work experience into degree accreditation both at the bachelor and advanced degree level for adults who have held positions of higher responsibility or possess special skills.

There is a compelling need for experimentation and innovation in such crucial areas as adult basic education. Consideration should be given to the creation of at least one adult education laboratory to develop new approaches to all levels of continuing education.

The debate on public television now before the American people has important implications for continuing education. Such a system, properly conceived and administered can bring new continuing education and cultural experience to millions. The President has directed a study to be made of the potential of instructional television—and I would urge that the application of the media to adult education problems should be included.

With today's technology and its implications for change, affluence and leisure, education has become a way of life for our people. For millions growing up, education cannot stop even with an advanced degree. The nation is fortunate in the measure of development of its adult and continuing education, however many its shortcomings. Our challenge now is to build upon the system we have developed to meet today's needs so that those of tomorrow will be met even more effectively.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

By T. Howard Walker
President, NUEA

Under the able leadership of Charles Milner, this past year has shown marked growth in our Association's effectiveness, its expansion in depth, and in scope. However, if I were to choose a text for today's remarks, I would quote, as others have, that distinguished philosopher Satchel Paige who said, "Don't look behind. Something may be gaining on you!"

So what is ahead?

I will ask the new board for permission to appoint committee members immediately. Further, this conference is designed so that the officers of each division, section, and committee will meet Tuesday in order to complete the past year's work, including their respective reports to our Editor for the early printing and distribution of the *Proceedings*. I know that the officers will make every effort to muster quorums for these meetings so that these sessions may also actually serve as effective first meetings of the new year.

NUEA has strength directly in proportion to the effectiveness of the work of its committees, its sections, its divisions; and its board; and in proportion as these are coordinated and working between annual conferences as well as at these meetings. Quarterly progress reports will be requested.

This year we will stress your personal involvement. We are making every effort to encourage you, each of you, to step forward and say what you would like to do for the Association this coming year. You should give your Association and committee officers at least two of your own choices for assignment. Do this please. You will be hearing from me on this matter.

Tomorrow evening the past presidents and the new and old board members will be hosts at an informal idea-exchange session. This meeting is scheduled so that all of us can get to know each other better, so you can test your ideas, and so we can gain from our combined resources and talents, again, right now, early in the year. Everything we can do to strengthen our team is important.

We will do more than just talk. In the spectrum of higher education, a clear understanding of what extension can do best must be determined, made clear in our thinking, and implemented. In order to clarify the position of the Association and to determine guidelines for future directions, I am asking that, as a start, a group which I will appoint, hold a three-day meeting to begin the drafting of a new Position Paper to fit current conditions. A general chairman will be appointed. A chief writer and a three-member writing team will be designated. Ten or more persons, highly knowledgeable in the particular as well as general aspects of the Association's area of interest, and several persons from outside the Association, will develop a working document. During this entire year, each committee, section, and division will be asked to begin its work now on what it wants to have included and emphasized in this document. Hopefully, the final draft will be ready for adoption at the Annual Conference in Miami after a full year of work on all its parts.

I will mention several areas needing special attention and effort as we proceed with our work during the year: our professional development, liberal education for adults, data collection, research, the problem of adult drop-out, the problem of professional obsolescence, extramural independent study, public television and radio, continuing education for women and programs for special groups, standards for maintaining membership in the Association, affiliation or merger with associations interested in higher adult education, governmental relations, community-urban problems, and the question of how your officers can be most effective in the face of new societal demands on our Association.

More of our energy and attention must be directed toward the professional development and research missions of our Association—much more. John W. Gardner, in his article, "How to Prevent Organizational Dry Rot," states that:

> "The first rule is that the organization must have an effective program for recruitment and development of talent. People are the ultimate source of renewal. The shortage of able, highly trained, highly motivated men will be a permanent feature of our kind of society: and every organization that wants its share of the short supply is going to have to get out and fight for it."

Our efforts in recruitment and professional development in extension must become effective. The Education Professions Development Act will be most helpful in this regard and should be supported by the Association.

Our research goals need clarification; then implementation. For example, we need some "in-house" research for the guidance of our Association and to improve the effectiveness of programs.

Data collection and its proper utilization is a highly complex matter. Again, our effectiveness must be further developed and improved. The Association is attempting to do some of its work without having adequate data in readily usable form and is handicapped in doing additional meaningful work because of the same lack.

It will be heartily welcomed if divisions, say the Correspondence Study Division or the Audio-Visual Division, were to recommend a new surge or an addition to their missions, as I think they will, so as to make these divisions even more responsive to the total needs of our member institutions.

It is not too soon to have our Association actively and appropriately providing additional leadership in the whole area of public television and radio.

To me, membership of an institution in this Association should mean more than passing the "entrance examination." In too many cases, institutional concern and support have diminished during the last decade or two! Some extension or continuing education divisions are forced to behave exactly like proprietary schools and industries. The philosophy is too often one of embarking upon programs only if they will break even or be profitable. All of us are more or less forced to accept self-support principle that has been obsolete for two decades. We will give attention to institutional requirements for maintaining membership in this Association.

On Wednesday, your executive director and president are meeting with representatives of other adult education associations interested in exploring further cooperation, affiliation, or merger. Let your board members know your feelings about these matters, and ask them where they stand.

In the event that I am leaving the impression that all your president is going to do is to announce meetings, appoint committees, and set deadlines, let me assure you that there are long-range aims which must at all times provide the frame of reference within which we approach the immediate problems of the day. These long-range aims are what the Quakers would call "concerns."

These are some of my concerns: (1) It seems to me there is an unduly great interest in the material things of life, in contrast to the interest in transcendent values.

(2) I am concerned with my ability and perhaps you are similarly concerned about your ability, to communicate completely and effectively with another person without perceiving the color of his skin, the texture of his hair. And yet, we are very concerned about his economic and social welware—and above all, about his individual human worth.

(3) As we persuade ourselves of our virtues in contrast to profit-making, proposal-writing, proprietary-management enterprises, I am concerned that neither our Association nor our member institutions, severally, can persuade various federal agencies of the quality of instruction and effectiveness of the management we can bring to these problems.

(4) I am concerned about how we can perform our functions effectively as we grow bigger and our society grows more complex. (It must be remembered that we have contributed to these complexities. For example, we provided the research and teaching out of which came the passage of Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the State Technical Services Act and others.) I recommend your careful reading of *The Campus and The State*, by Moos and Rourke (John Hopkins Press.)

As your president during the coming year, I will try to keep these concerns uppermost in my thoughts and deeds, as I know your other officers will. Working together, we will make progress toward the identification of appropriate new long-range goals.

Eleven scholars, as long ago as 1961, wrote this statement: "A society that makes its educational investment almost entirely in children and in youth is on the way to becoming obsolete, and is reducing its chances for survival." The man who today says our *primary* responsibility is to the young has his verb in the wrong tense. It used to be that way. We know it is no longer that way.

If survival of our society is the larger goal, if universities have a leadership responsibility in assisting society to survive, then those of us in this room must be in the most strategic position of any group in our society to provide the vehicle for the survival endeavor. It is an uncomparable challenge.

With deep humility, I thank you, again, for allowing me to serve in the highest office in the field of higher adult education. I ask you now for your help as we move forward together.

BUSINESS MEETING

TUESDAY, APRIL 25

President Milner called the meeting to order. Secretary-Treasurer Drazek presented the financial report, and moved its acceptance. Director Ray seconded the motion, which was passed.

Director Pitchell discussed in detail certain aspects of the report and noted that NUEA's excess income amounted to $18,231.87.

Secretary-Treasurer Drazek reported on the dues structure, and moved that the present dues structure continue for the next fiscal year as recommended by the board of directors. Motion was seconded by Dean Thompson and carried.

Director Russell F. W. Smith reported that the 1968 conference would be held in Miami Beach, Florida, July 19-23, 1968, at the Deauville Hotel. The 1969 meeting would be on December 6-11, 1969, Washington, D.C., as a part of the "Galaxy Conference." He noted that the board recommended a summer conference for July, 1970, preferably west of the Mississippi. Dean Verhaalen moved acceptance of Director Smith's report, seconded by Mr. Madden. Carried.

Secretary-Treasurer Drazek reviewed the applications for membership and moved that they be accepted. Director Ray seconded. Carried. The new members are: Auburn University, Colorado State University, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, Florida State University, Humboldt State College, New Mexico State University, State University of New York at Albany, State University of New York (Central), Orange County Community College, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Roosevelt University, and University of South Florida.

Secretary-Treasurer Drazek proposed the motion to amend the bylaws to divide the office of secretary-treasurer into the office of the secretary and the office of the treasurer. Director Fischer seconded. Carried. Text of the motion follows these minutes.

President Milner called for the division, section and committee reports. He suggested that these be forwarded as soon as possible to Secretary-Treasurer Drazek for inclusion in the *Proceedings*.

Although several members had to depart early, President Milner hoped that their reports would be submitted shortly.

The *Committee on Awards* reported that the University of Chicago, Oakland, Michigan State University, and Robert Hattery had received special recognition for their unique programs.

Director Ray expressed the deep appreciation of the association to Messrs. Soop and Storey and the University of Michigan for hosting the conference. The members gave the two men a standing ovation.

The Audio Visual, Community Development, and Correspondence Divisions indicated that their written reports would be submitted.

Conferences and Institutes Division: Al Storey reported that a week-long conference was conducted at the University of Georgia for newcomers to Conferences and Institutes work. The interest in professional development of C&I personnel led to the program which featured the outstanding speakers at the present conference. A written report will be submitted.

Evening Colleges and Class Extension Division: Donald Woods stated that a written report would be submitted. Dean Lowell Eklund said the division was grateful for the outstanding contribution made by Professor Howard McCluskey of the University of Michigan.

Residential Center Management Section: Richard Stottler stated that a written report would be submitted for this new section. He noted that the steering committee was in the process of revising the proposed by-laws for this section. President Milner expressed his appreciation to Mr. Stottler for his assistance in organizing this section on so short period of time.

Research Section: T. Howard Walker indicated a written report would be submitted. He added that William Griffith of the University of Chicago had provided this committee with a great deal of assistance during the past year and the future looks promising.

The World Affairs Committee: Indicated that its report would be filed, but its recommendations are in the printed Resolutions (see page 112).

Executive Director Pitchell reported that Paul Miller, assistant secretary of HEW, had invited NUEA to attend the International Education Act meetings.

Teacher Education Section: Gordon Godbey reported that a written summary would be submitted. He added that there was a great amount of interest in the newly established section. President Milner expressed his appreciation to Mr. Godbey for organizing the new section.

Director Smith was asked to report on the Kellogg Proposal, and he indicated that a proposal would be submitted shortly.

Organizational Structure: Director Robinson reported that the Board of Directors had changed this from an ad hoc to a permanent committee. He reviewed the qualifications for affiliate membership. He also mentioned that the Handbook would be kept up-to-date if at all possible.

Awards and Honors: Mr. Madden reported a written summary would be submitted for inclusion in the *Proceedings*.

Discussion and Debate: Dean Easton reported this committee is now serving 49 of the 50 states, and is operating on the income without having had to touch its reserve. He hoped all 50 states would participate in the High School Discussion and Debate program next year.

Government Relations: President-elect Walker reported that public hearings on Title I and Title V would take place this week in Washington, D.C.

Inter-Associational Relations: Speaking for Mr. Ratchford, Mr. Walker indicated a written report would be submitted.

Program Committee: Mr. Walker indicated, with justifiable pride, that the program was well executed.

Regional Meetings: Director Pitchell reported for Mr. Sherburne that the Deans and Directors had indicated general acceptance of the regional structure at the roundtable. The association hopes that regional meetings will be planned and that the regional group leaders meet as a group at the annual conference.

Vestibule Committee: Secretary-Treasurer Drazek reported that the Vestibule Session was extremely successful, with 50 newcomers in the field and representatives of new NUEA institutions present.

Publications and Public Affairs: Dean Thompson, speaking for Chairman Mitchell, indicated that a written report would be submitted. President Milner extended the association's thanks to Mrs. Helen Farlow and also to her dean, Stanley Robinson and the University of Illinois, for her services.

Minimum Data and Definitions: Chairman Frandson reported that this committee had successfully urged the Office of Education to conduct a national survey of all university and college presidents this fall for a report on primarily non-credit courses.

American Alumni Council: Dean Lowell Eklund said that this Council is ready and eager to cooperate with NUEA, and hopes that the NUEA member institutions will reciprocate and work with them in regional conferences to provide the know-how to administer educational programs. He urged NUEA institutions to consider the possibility of hosting these conferences.

Dean Robinson made the motion, seconded by Mr. Madden, to accept the committee, section and division reports. Carried.

Resolutions Committee: Since Mr. Gustafson had to leave early, Mr. Woods reported and moved adoption of the resolutions. Seconded by Dean Utley. Discussion ensued.

Dean Easton moved, seconded by Dean Ray, to amend the original motion by adding to it to adopt the resolutions subject to the editing as authorized by the president. Further discussion continued.

Then Dean Easton moved that the board be requested to report at the next annual meeting to consider an award for institutions and associations. Mr. Madden seconded this motion.

Director Ray moved to add the word "persons" to the above motion, seconded by Dean Easton. This motion was passed.

The motion to accept the Resolutions report was carried.

Executive Director Pitchell reviewed briefly the report from the Washington office. He said that any members who were in the Washington area should be free to call on his office for desk service, phone, accepting mail, hotel reservations, that they are welcome to use the NUEA facilities.

He noted that the agenda for the board meetings were sent to his office.

President Milner called for new business. He wished to extend special recognition at this time to Mrs. Margaret Bell, administrative assistant to Mr. Pitchell, Lynn Mack, director of the NUEA Management Center at Silver Spring, and Mrs. Elinor Seidel, University of Maryland, for assistance in recording the minutes.

The gavel was then passed from President Milner to President-elect Walker. President Walker presented a special gavel to ex-President Milner, the symbol of the association's appreciation.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Proposed Motion

BE IT RESOLVED that the bylaws of the Association be revised as follows:

That ARTICLE IV, *Section 1*, be amended by substituting the term "secretary" for the term "secretary-treasurer."

That ARTICLE IV, *Section 4*, be revised to read as follows: "The secretary of the corporation shall have the custody of the charter, bylaws, minutes, records and books of the corporation. He shall maintain an up-to-date roll of all members. He shall record all minutes and votes of the meetings of the members of the corporation, of the board of directors, and of the executive committee of the board."

That the following be added as ARTICLE V, *Section 5*: "The board of directors shall, each year immediately following the annual meeting of the membership, elect from its members a treasurer who shall be the official custodian of all monies belonging to the corporation. He shall direct the receipt of all such monies and cause to have them deposited or invested consistent with the directions and actions of the executive committee. He shall propose the annual budget to the board of directors, and shall present a report of the financial status of the corporation at the annual meeting of the members and at the regular meetings of the board of directors. He shall arrange for an annual audit of the books of the corporation."

That ARTICLE V, *Section 3*, be revised causing the phrase, "and the secretary-treasurer shall constitute the executive committee" to read, "the secretary, and the treasurer shall constitute the executive committee."

That the person elected secretary-treasurer at the 1967 annual meeting be designated as the secretary.

NUEA RESOLUTIONS, 1967

I. General

WHEREAS, the fifty-second meeting of the National University Extension Association convened in Ann Arbor, Michigan, on the campus of the University of Michigan has as its host institutions the University of Michigan in cooperation with the Michigan NUEA Universities: the Central Michigan University, the Eastern Michigan University, the Michigan Technical University, the Michigan State University, the Northern Michigan University, the Oakland University, the Wayne State University and the Western Michigan University, and

WHEREAS, special recognition is given to the University of Michigan on the occasion of its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary, and

WHEREAS, the host institution has exhibited genuine concern for the comfort and pleasure of their guests, has contributed to creating an atmosphere conducive to the work of the association, and made available excellent provisions for a successful meeting, and,

WHEREAS, the staff and associated persons from these institutions and specifically those from the extension services have cordially and unselfishly extended their hospitality and facilities to those in attendance at this meeting, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the office of the secretary of the NUEA be instructed to convey in writing to the president of the University of Michigan and to the presidents of the cooperating Michigan NUEA Universities, with copies to members of their staffs who served, the gratitude and appreciation of the NUEA for the efforts, the planning, and the cordial courteous reception given all who attended the fifty-second annual meeting of the NUEA, and be it further resolved also that special thanks and appreciation be extended to the staff and personnel of the Michigan Union for the hospitality and courtesies extended the NUEA membership while making use of their facilities and services during the 1967 annual meeting of the NUEA, and

WHEREAS, the institutions having membership in the NUEA were pleased with the leadership and effectiveness of the NUEA in matters affecting continuing education during the year just ending, and

WHEREAS, that the incoming president, Howard Walker, and the outgoing president, Charles F. Milner, and the board of directors of NUEA worked together as a team toward the expansion of continuing education for educational improvements in American institutions of higher education, therefore, IT IS RESOLVED, that the president and the board of directors are to be commended upon their cooperative effort to improve the association, member institutions and continuing education in the United States. We wish to especially commend our outgoing president, Charles F. Milner, and the retiring members of the board of directors, Russell F. W. Smith and Donald M. Searcy, for the able leadership and the contributions they have made during a rigorous year of growth and change.

II. Correspondence Study Division

WHEREAS, Mrs. Lois Badger of the University of Colorado, Mrs. Lillian Barns of the North Carolina State University, and Mrs. Helen Carleton of the Louisiana State University, have given long, faithful and devoted service to the field of correspondence study and to the NUEA through the Correspondence Study Division.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Division of Correspondence Study and the membership of NUEA express their appreciation and acknowledge such services upon their retirement from their member institutions, and BE IT RESOLVED, further that the NUEA make this resolution a part of its record and transmit copies thereof to these persons.

WHEREAS, the members of the Correspondence Study Division of the NUEA are dependent on the successful operation of the U.S. Postal Service in their efforts to bring educational resources and opportunities to the fifty states and to many foreign countries,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Correspondence Study Division of the NUEA expresses to Mr. Lawrence O'Brien, Postmaster General of the United States, its concern with the problems of the U.S. Postal Service,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Postal Service continue the efforts now being made to improve the service by means of the use of new technical and mechanical devices and that appropriate and opportune action be taken to implement plans for improving and regulating an efficient postal service.

III. Committee on World Affairs

WHEREAS, it is a basic requirement of the American system that there be a continuing dialogue between government and citizenry on the great questions of public policy, and

WHEREAS, this requirement is especially crucial in the area of foreign policy in the light of America's role of leadership in international affairs, and

WHEREAS, this places a vital responsibility on all educational agencies in this field, particularly on the universities which continue to become the most important source of world affairs expertise outside of the government. However, these agencies have been gravely handicapped by a lack of adequate funds and staff in a task that cannot be supported by current fiscal practices,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the NUEA commends the Congress of the U.S. for including in the International Education Act the provisions for adult citizen education in world affairs and encourages the appropriate funding for this purpose.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, and ordered that this resolution be communicated to the appropriate branches and agencies of the Federal Government.

IV. Awards and Honors Committee

WHEREAS, many persons, institutions and associations are rendering extraordinary service to continuing education, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the NUEA board of directors should give consideration to creating a special award of recognition for such services. This award could be similar to but distinct from the Julius M. Nolte Award and could also be named in honor of some distinguished person whose name the NUEA wishes to perpetuate,

WHEREAS, the members of the National University Extension Association note the passing of Earnest S. Brandenburg who served as a member of the board of directors of NUEA and gave distinguished service to the cause of education in the nation, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Brandenburg served for ten years as dean of University College of Washington University at St. Louis. Enrollments in credit programs more than doubled during that ten-year period under the innovative leadership of Dean Brandenburg. The creation of an adult counselor service for evening students and an experimental studies and research program served as models for many institutions setting up similar programs. Trans-Action magazine—part of a Community Leadership project—was also founded under his direction,

WHEREAS, Dr. Brandenburg also served as president of AUEC and was a leader in local and state adult education organizations. At the time of his death, March 28, 1967, he was a nationally known educator and president of Drury College in Springfield, Missouri.

BE IT RESOLVED that we mourn the death of our beloved colleague and extend to his wife, Mrs. Lauree Phelson Brandenburg, the daughter Barbara, and son, James, deepest sympathy of the members of the National University Extension Association and cherish with them the memory of a noble husband and father and a great and dedicated leader in continuing education.

V. NUEA Programs — Board Liaison

WHEREAS, the NUEA is going through a general expansion in members and total services to continuing education in the entire United States, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the NUEA board be commended for expanding the Washington facilities in usefulness by the addition of the secondary service facility and by the renewal of the Adult Basic Education Teacher Training Institute contract for the U.S. for the summer of 1967

WHEREAS, the U.S. Office of Education, as the duly authorized leader in educational growth and change in the nation, has been effective, and

WHEREAS, there has developed a fine coordination of effort between the U.S. Office of Education and the educational institutions of the nation, and

WHEREAS, there has been a high level of achievement on the part of the members of NUEA in the rapid implementation of programs under new legislation, and

WHEREAS, the NUEA board and the NUEA Committee on Governmental Relations have had a significant impact on new legislation, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the NUEA board and the executive committee are to be commended on their close cooperation with the U.S. Office of Education, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the NUEA board, the Governmental Relations Committee and the executive committee be urged to continue their effective cooperation and assistance in the promotion and development of new legislation, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the NUEA membership commends the U.S. Office of Education on its helpfulness and assistance and requests that copies of this resolution be sent to the Commissioner of Education and to the Bureau of Adult and Vocational Education of the U.S. Office of Education, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the NUEA board be commended for bringing about a recognition of the professional differences between the continuing educational services of the colleges and universities as against the educational policies and methods of private profit and nonprofit corporations. The NUEA board and the executive committee are strongly urged to continue the exploration of this delineation of differences.

BE IT RESOLVED that the board of NUEA and the President of NUEA be instructed to again send on behalf of the association letters of appreciation to the President of the United States and his staff and to the relevant committees and subcommittees of both Houses of the Congress and their staffs for their continued support of higher education programs.

BE IT RESOLVED that the board of NUEA on behalf of the association continue support and cooperation with the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education and that the council be so notified by the secretary of the association.

BE IT RESOLVED that the board of NUEA continue to work with the Bureau of the Budget and the U.S. Office of Education to secure the acceptance of the standard practices and procedures in the various universities with regard to fiscal matters involving Title I and other government support programs. It is urged that further efforts be made to secure the development of appropriate unique facilitative principles for determining education training and costs.

BE IT RESOLVED that the board of NUEA be instructed to continue the ongoing effort to secure legislation in support of the education of the citizenry in public and world affairs by the inclusion in such legislation of provisions for adult citizen education

VI. Administrative and Fiscal Affairs Section

WHEREAS the Section on Administrative and Fiscal Affairs of NUEA and its predecessor committee have been performing a necessary function in the NUEA, and

WHEREAS interest has been demonstrated by increasing attendance and participation of NUEA members at the annual program provided by the section, and

WHEREAS in order to provide an expansion of program areas for the benefit of interested members of NUEA, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that the board of directors of NUEA allocate funds to be used under the direction of the steering committee of the section on Administrative and Fiscal Affairs to provide suitable programs to be presented by the section at the annual meeting of the National University Extension Association.

Submitted by: Resolutions Committee, 1967
Donald Z. Woods, University of Minnesota
Eugene Ross Magruder, George Washington University
Smith Higgins, University of Indiana
Gordon Godbey, Pennsylvania State University
Ben G. Gustafson, University of North Dakota, Chairman

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETINGS

SATURDAY, APRIL 22

8 a.m. Breakfast Meeting:

PRESENT: Directors Bosworth, Child, Drazek, Jenusaitis, Lawshe, Milner, Powell, Ray and Pitchell. Also present were Messrs. Soop, Storey, and Harold Glen Clark.

MINUTES: The meeting was opened by President Milner, and he asked Harold Glen Clark to offer grace.

Messrs. Soop and Storey explained the arrangements for the conference. Advance registrations exceeded all expectations; the latest count was 496 and this included some invited guests and speakers. Mr. Storey mentioned that housing shortages developed; fortunately, one motel managed to open its doors early to accommodate the NUEA overflow. Similarly, the Sunday buffet dinner was completely sold out, but the management was able to increase the number by approximately 30, or 10 per cent.

Although the University of Michigan is serving as the host institution, eight other Michigan universities are cooperating by providing coordinators at many of the sessions. This cooperation was gratifying to Messrs. Soop and Storey.

Everything was progressing satisfactorily. Transportation between the Michigan Union and the various motels was arranged to accommodate NUEA delegates.

9:30 Session (continued from Breakfast Meeting)

President Milner called the meeting together at 9:35 a.m. In addition to the Board members present at the breakfast session, Directors Charters and Woods arrived. Also in attendance were Mrs. Margaret Bell of the NUEA Management Center staff and Mrs. Elinor Seidel, University of Maryland, who assisted in recording the official minutes.

Director Lawshe made a motion to accept the minutes of the March 22, 1967 meeting, seconded by Director Robinson. Director Drazek indicated that the word "Passed" should be added to page 2, paragraph 6. Director Bosworth noted that the fourth word in paragraph 2, page 3, should be corrected to spell "should." The Board approved the Minutes of the March 22 meeting as corrected.

Executive Director Pitchell was asked to report on the financial statement (to be distributed from that office). Before discussing the report, Director Pitchell explained the need to poll members of the Board of Directors over the phone in order to obtain approval in accepting the application for admission to NUEA by Cleveland State University and authorizing a visitation team. Director Lawshe made a motion, seconded by Director Searcy, that approval of the telephone poll be recorded in the minutes.

Members polled included Directors Milner, Walker, Drazek, Charters, Smith, Jenusaitis, Robinson and Lawshe. Motion passed.

Director Pitchell then discussed the Financial Report.

1. He explained that one page was missing from the report. This reflects the Head Start account, which was still not closed out pending a refund

from the Federal Government. This will be added to the Financial Report later.

2. The Summary Sheet is not the audited copy and will be added later. This will reflect the adjustment in the *Guides'* revolving fund figure and will represent the expenses for March. The University of Minnesota will supply these data.

3. $52,400 in dues was collected for the fiscal year which ended on March 31. Three institutions (including the Massachusetts State System) failed to pay their dues. The Massachusetts State System asked to withdraw from NUEA in view of the re-organization in the state. Discussed later were the Universities of Montreal and Manitoba, which have been delinquent in their dues for the past year.

4. Dues for the current year are coming in at a rapid rate; $13,000 has been received to date.

5. Director Lawshe asked whether the visitation fee of $200 covers the costs of the team adequately, and discussion followed. Consensus agreed that plane fares and other items had gone up, and when needed could be reviewed at a later date. However, the current visitation fee appeared adequate at this time.

6. Director Pitchell noted that the *Spectator* income has improved, primarily due to the increase in subscription rates which were raised from $1 to $5.

7. Director Pitchell stated that his office was still receiving orders for the Golden Anniversary publication; it is also being used for promotional purposes.

8. The question was raised concerning the Head Start amounts due NUEA and whether the government was obligated to pay interest on the funds still pending. Director Pitchell indicated that he did not think so.

9. Depreciation on the furniture will be included in the revised financial statement.

10. Director Pitchell reviewed some of the problems that he has with U.S. Office of Education on the Adult Basic Education project.

11. Director Pitchell noted that there was a balance of $742.59 remaining in the Sears fund. The Board agreed with Director Child that the incoming Community Development officers should make a decision regarding the disposition of these monies, and should send their recommendations to the board of directors. Director Walker suggested that it might be a good idea to refund any leftover money to the Sears Foundation. Director Smith added that another way of handling this matter might be to ask the Sears Foundation whether it would like NUEA to use the unexpended funds to add to another project in which there were mutual interests.

12. Director Pitchell said that the Publications Committee had been asked to make suggestions for revising the complimentary subscription lists for the *Spectator* in an effort to reduce the printing costs.

13. Director Pitchell suggested that the board authorize the Finance Committee to make recommendations to the treasurer for new bank deposits in order to get the highest, but safest, rate of interest available.

Discussion followed. Director Lawshe recommended that the guidance of the Finance Committee be requested on this matter, and the board agreed. The Finance Committee was asked to report its recommendations to the board at one of the subsequent meetings.

14. Director Pitchell discussed the Food and Drug Administration Project and added that some 50 highpowered individuals had been invited to Washington for a conference next week, and that he would represent NUEA.

He also indicated that NUEA's report to the FDA was not as helpful as had been anticipated, because the instrument as designed proved inadequate in terms of non-extension people. The pharmacy people kept no records, he reported.

15. The deficit of $857.11 on the *Guides* was discussed, and Director Pitchell noted that this was due in large part to the numbers being sold at cost to the member institutions. It was noted that a person from the Louisiana State University, trained in business administration, had agreed to conduct a study to analyze the problems attendant to the *Guide*. Further discussion was delayed pending Miss Powell's return to the Board meeting.

16. Director Pitchell said that the 11-year summary figure for March 31, 1966 "Overhead and Management Fees" should be changed from $47,500 to $50,000.

Director Searcy made a motion, seconded by Director Robinson to accept the financial statement as reported. Motion carried.

Mrs. Margaret Bell, administrative assistant to Mr. Pitchell, was introduced to the board. Mrs. Elinor Seidel, coordinator for University College, University of Maryland, was also introduced.

President Milner recommended that the board accept the following individuals as members of the Elections Committee: R. D. Johnson, Kentucky—Chairman; Arthur Buswell, Alaska; and Clifford L. Winters, Jr., Syracuse.

Director Lawshe moved, Director Drazek seconded, that the recommendations of the president for the Elections Committee be approved. Passed.

President Milner asked Dean Harold Glen Clark to report on the Honors and Awards Committee. Dean Clark covered the following items:

1. Bower Aly is the first recipient of the Nolte Award.

2. E. L. Keller will be awarded the Julius M. Nolte plaque at the Monday luncheon. Delays had prevented his receiving the award earlier.

3. Lorentz Adolfson, nominated and approved for the J. M. Nolte award earlier, will receive it at this meeting. Mr. McNeil has prepared the citation.

4. James R. D. Eddy, retiring dean of the University of Texas, will be awarded the Fellow of Extension Key and the citation will be read by Norris Hiett.

5. Gavels have been prepared.

6. Dean Clark noted that the Conferences and Institutes Division rewards outstanding persons in that field, and he thought that other Divisions might wish to make similar awards. Dean Clark stated that institutional awards to specific universities for having innovative programs of distinction might merit an award. The guidelines for determining institutional eligibility, though difficult to formulate, must be developed.

7. Dean Clark further suggested that individuals overseas, industrialists, and businessmen might also be considered for the Julius M. Nolte award, and that perhaps the organization may not wish to limit the awarding of the award exclusively to persons within its own group.

Director Ray suggested that the Nolte Award might well be reserved for those who have served the association directly, and another award be incorporated for those outside the NUEA sphere. Discussion followed. Dean

Clark concluded that the spirit of the Nolte Award was designed to widen the field rather than to restrict it.

Director Robinson moved that Dean Clark's report be accepted, and Director Ray seconded the motion. Approved.

A 10-minute coffee break followed.

President Milner asked Director Pitchell to report on the status of institutional applications for membership.

1. The University of Miami, under Dean Robert Allen, has sent a letter indicating interest in membership. Director Child made a motion to approve acceptance of the letter and appointment of a visitation team and this was seconded by Director Jenusaitis. Carried.

2. Director Lawshe made a motion that the board of directors delegate to the Executive Committee the authority to approve the appointment of visitation teams in connection with official applications for membership to NUEA. Director Bosworth seconded the motion. Carried.

3. Director Pitchell distributed the reports of the visitation teams for the various institutions which had applied for membership and the following institutions were recommended and all were unanimously approved individually by the Board:

Name of Institution	*Visited by Team /*	*Motion to Approve /*	*Seconded*
New Mexico State	Fitzgerald and Hiett	Searcy	Ray
Colorado State University	Kitchens and Easton	Searcy	Jenusaitis
Roosevelt University	Higgins and Lang	Ray	Searcy
Florida A. & M.	Madden and Arnold	Ray	Searcy
Florida State University	Pellegrin and Inman	Searcy	Robinson
U. of Southern Florida	Pellegrin and Inman	Powell	Smith

Special note was made that all institutions were approved unanimously by the board.

Director Pitchell added that Cleveland State University had requested to have the visitation delayed, and action on this institution would be carried forward into 1968. The University of Miami, Florida, would also be visited by a team and action carried into 1968.

Following the action on the newly admitted institutions, it was noted there would be a total of 133 member NUEA institutions, if the board's action is approved by the members at the General Business Session on Tuesday.

Director Lawshe suggested that it might be well to evolve some guidelines for members appointed to visitation teams. Director Pitchell noted that the teams usually consist of one "old" member and one new member, and that his office has been sending two or three reports prepared by previous teams as possible guidelines for the appointed visitation team.

Discussion ensued about changing the name of the Ad Hoc Committee on Organizational Structure and Fee Modification, and making it a permanent committee. Director Drazek moved, seconded by Director Ray, to change the Ad Hoc Committee on Organizational Structure and Fee Modification to a standing committee called the "Committee on Organizational Structure." Carried.

Director Smith moved, seconded by Director Drazek, that the function of considering fee modifications be assigned to the Finance Committee. Carried.

Discussion followed about individual membership, and President Milner suggested that Director Robinson report back to the board following the morning meeting of his committee regarding affiliate memberships.

Director Drazek moved, and Director Bosworth seconded, that the motion that the Committee on Organizational Structure a) review the current status of divisions and sections including names, functions and organization, and b) review the criteria for institutional membership with regard to the permanency of membership limitations on qualifications and other pertinent matters which might have specific relevance or criteria for visitation teams.

Director Robinson moved, Director Lawshe seconded, that there be no revision in the dues structure of the membership for the next year. Passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:59 p.m. for luncheon.

MONDAY, APRIL 24

PRESENT: Directors Bosworth, Charters, Child, Drazek, Jenusaitis, Lawshe, Milner, Powell, Ray, Robinson, Searcy, Smith, Walker, White, Woods, and Executive Director Pitchell. Also present were Messrs. Eley and Hoiberg, and Mrs. Seidel.

MINUTES: President Milner called the meeting to order at 7:35 a.m., and invited Director Smith to say the grace.

President Milner indicated that Harold Glen Clark's committee recommended that the presentation of the Fellow of Extension Key to Dean Eddy be accompanied by the following statement:

> "It is a pleasure to announce that the NUEA board of directors, acting under the provision of our revised charter and by-laws, hereby grant you, James R. D. Eddy, the first honorary membership in the National University Extension Association effective with the date of your retirement."

Director Drazek moved, seconded by Director Lawshe, that the above statement be accepted. Carried.

President Milner called for the divisional reports. Miss Powell, representing the Division on Correspondence Study, suggested that President-Elect Walker attend the division's meetings since the division is attempting to determine whether a change in the title of the division was advisable. She also commented on the presentation by Mr. Ben Zeff relative to the proposed change in the USAFI contracts which would add dependents and civilian personnel related to the Department of Defense. She also stated that several other government agencies, among them AID, Peace Corps, Farm Service, etc., were interested in this contract. Discussion also included the Post Office Department mail delays and the resulting problems for those involved in correspondence study. Miss Powell discussed future reprinting of the *Guides* and suggested that the operation be moved to the Washington office as soon as possible. The Division recommended that more active promotion should be encouraged. The Division feels that the member universities should be permitted to buy the *Guides* in bulk amounts at cost and distribute them through their institutions. It was suggested that Director Pitchell include this information announcement in a future Washington Office mailing. Mention should be made that the *Guide* is available and every attempt be made to reduce the $3745 inventory. Director Lawshe felt that the national office might encourage a major promotional effort, such as public service TV time, and thus advance the *Guide to Correspondence Study*.

The board agreed that the participating institutions should be permitted to obtain the *Guide* at bulk rate, minimal cost, and individual buyers may pay more.

Director Pitchell recommended that the board establish the policy, and that the Executive Committee should develop the details. Miss Powell was asked to bring suggestions to the next meeting of the board.

The board expressed its thanks to Miss Powell who will complete her service on the board this year. Miss Powell announced that Denver Sloane will be the Correspondence Division's new board representative.

Director Child, reporting for the Division of Community Development, introduced Mr. Otto Hoiberg, who would be that division's new representative to the board. Mr. Child said that following his March report to the board, no new developments have occurred. However, the Community Development Division was adopting new by-laws which would not conflict with the association's by-laws. The board extended its thanks to Director Child for his valuable assistance to the board.

Director White, speaking for the Division of Audio Visual Communications, stated that the division was considering the question of its existence in its present form. He added that this was his last appearance as a board member, and the question of a continuing member would be decided before the next board meeting. The board thanked Director White for his assistance on the board.

Director Woods reported for the Division of Evening Colleges and Class Extension. He mentioned the need to explore the relationships with junior colleges—"the competition," and that the study of tuition, pay, compensation, fees, etc., needs an association-wide individual approach rather than frequent and spotty canvassing of members. This is Director Woods' final term as a board member, and the board extended its thanks to him. His replacement will probably be Mr. Lowell Eklund, Director Woods stated.

Director Jenusaitis reported that the pre-conference workshops of his Division of Conferences and Institutes had been most successful. For his division he expressed thanks to the board for its moral and financial support. The board expressed its appreciation to Director Jenusaitis who is leaving this year. His replacement will be either James Lahr, Al Storey or Keith Glancy.

James Eley of Washington University, was asked to comment on the suggestion that a Section on Continuing Education of the Professions be considered. Director Lawshe made a motion, seconded by Director Charters, that the board authorize and direct the president of the association to appoint a committee to determine what section or sections, if any, should be established for groups of people concerned with continuing education of the professions, and to authorize the Executive Committee to implement their recommendations. Passed.

Director Lawshe reviewed the proposed concept of separating the office of treasurer and secretary. The proposal was discussed at length.

Director Smith moved that the board adopt the proposal, and the motion was seconded by Director Drazek. Motion carried.

Director Walker asked for the board's guidance on the emphasis to be placed on supporting various items of legislation. The consensus agreed that certain bills or acts should be emphasized, without dissipating the energy or influence of NUEA or its member institutions. For the moment, Title I legislation and the Professional Development Act should be supported, with primary emphasis on Title I.

Director Pitchell explained that several deans and directors, unaware that they should have picked up their ballots at the registration booth, may not be familiar with the changes in voting procedures. Hence, President Milner asked for the board's approval to allow the unclaimed ballots to be picked up at the general session, their votes recorded, and added to those submitted earlier. Director Bosworth moved, and the motion was seconded by Director Child. Carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 a.m.

TUESDAY, APRIL 25

PRESENT: Directors Bosworth, Charters, Child, Eklund*, Fischer*, Higgins*, Hoiberg*, Jenusaitis, Lawshe, Milner, Neuffer*, Powell, Ray, Robinson, Searcy, Sloan*, Smith, Walker, Woods, Executive Director Pitchell, Mrs. Seidel, and invited guests Messrs. Willard Thompson, Armand Hunter, and Glenn Goerke.

MINUTES: President Milner called the meeting to order at 7:40 a.m. He asked Director Neuffer to say grace. President Milner welcomed the new Board members.

Director Powell reported further on the *Guide To Correspondence Study*. She presented the following motion, seconded by Director Ray:

> The Correspondence Study Division recommends that the board of directors of NUEA appoint a committee consisting of three deans and directors and three correspondence study administrators to review the handling and the financing of the *Guide*, and to make a firm recommendation for the future regarding it, with the recommendation that the committee report some progress by 1 July.

Director Powell suggested that the Correspondence Division would like it noted that the preparation, editing and publishing of the *Guide* is handled by the division members without charge to NUEA.

She also noted that the division would like to have copies made available to members in bulk at cost (whatever they may prove to be) and to selected agencies (State Department, Agriculture Graduate School, AID., etc.) in small quantities (100-200) free of cost. The division further suggests that the Washington office handle the distribution and publicity for the *Guide*. It is hoped that the committee will explore seriously ways and means to make the *Guide* available free to all individual inquiries, and the division will welcome suggestions for NUEA financing—either by institutions or the association.

Discussion followed. Director Pitchell noted that there are some 35,000 *Guides* on inventory ($3,745), and Miss Powell noted that it is not yet out of date. She recommended that it be revised every 15 months, and that when the Washington office mails it, an insert should be added which would explain that the Correspondence Division is not equipped to answer questions of a general educational nature.

* new directors present

Director Robinson reiterated the need for a systematic promotional campaign in an effort to sell the *Guide*.

The motion to establish a committee to review the handling and financing of the *Guide* was passed.

Director Lawshe reported the Finance Committee's recommendations to the board:

1. that selling prices for additional copies of publications are recommended as follows: *Proceedings*: Increase from $2.00 to $3.00 per copy; *Joint AUEC-NUEA Report*: $2.00; *Handbook*: Up-to-date copy: $5.00; additional annual supplement—$2.00.

2. that, with respect to overhead charges or management fees, an interim guideline of 15% be established with the understanding that the Executive Committee shall have the authority to negotiate a different amount if desirable; and, that the executive director be instructed to have overhead cost analyses on past projects made in terms of (a) percent of total cost, and (b) percent of salary and wages including fringe benefits.

3. that the present restrictions of the board on the investment of surplus funds be withdrawn, and that the Executive Committee be empowered to make adjustments in the investment of funds as it sees fit.

Director Pitchell reported that he discussed with Howell McGee the question of standardizing the purchase price of the Joint AUEC-NUEA Report.

Regarding appropriate overhead charges, the board felt that it needed additional data in order to make an intelligent recommendation. It was indicated that an accountant would develop the actual overhead costs of earlier projects, with the hope that this data would enable the Finance Committee to develop a sound recommendation for the board.

Director Lawshe moved that paragraphs 1 and 2 of his report be accepted, seconded by Director Drazek, and the motion was carried.

Director Lawshe moved acceptance of paragraph 3 of his report relative to the present restriction on the investment of surplus funds. Seconded by Director Drazek. After some discussion, the motion was passed.

Director Drazek asked the board for authority to close out the bank account at the D. C. National Bank and open an account in the Silver Spring area, convenient to the NUEA Management Center location. Lynn Mack, director of the Management Center, would have funds available to him for the NUEA Management Center not to exceed $10,000, and he would be answerable to the executive director and the Executive Committee. The board requested that Mr. Mack be bonded at the earliest possible date and also recommended that persons who are authorized to have access to the other NUEA accounts also be bonded. Director Lawshe seconded the motion. Carried.

Armand Hunter, Michigan State University, discussed the new Guidelines for Library Services to Extension Students and indicated that his committee recommends NUEA's endorsement of the ACRL Committee on Standards guidelines (a copy follows.) Mr. Bosworth moved acceptance; seconded by Director Drazek. Discussion followed, and the motion carried.

Director Robinson reported on the affiliate membership suggestion, modification, and moved the adoption of this report. Director Lawshe seconded the motion, which was carried.

Director Pitchell reported that the NUEA regional structure had been discussed at the Deans and Directors Round Table and there was no obvious dissent. Director Drazek moved that the board take the formal action of accepting the Sherburne Committee's regional structure at the annual meeting. Motion, seconded by Director Robinson, was passed.

Director Smith introduced Glenn Goerke of Florida, who reported that arrangements had been made to hold the 1968 annual meeting at the Deauville Hotel, Miami Beach, Florida, July 19-20 (pre-workshop sessions) and 21-23, 1968. A guarantee of 500 rooms under one roof was extended.

Director Smith said the 1969 conference will be held in conjunction with the "Galaxy Conference" in December, 1969. The 1970 conference site was not decided, although Indiana University, celebrating its sesquicentennial, had extended an invitation, April 24-29, 1970. Also, four Virginia institutions had indicated interest in hosting the 1970 conference. Director Smith proposed that he be directed to negotiate arrangements for 1970 during this year, and 1971 during the next year. Director Fischer seconded the motion, with the suggestion that the 1970 conference be held sometime in July and, if possible, somewhere west of the Mississippi River. The question of the continuation of the "Galaxy Conference" series would be decided after the 1969 conference, and this would not provide ample time for the 1970 and 1971 conference plans but possibly would provide adequate time to formulate the 1972 conference plans.

Director Drazek noted that the deans and directors had previously suggested that future conferences be held in those areas having adequate hotel accommodations rather than university centers.

President Milner announced that 585 registrants were reported by the University of Michigan at the present conference.

Director Pitchell was asked to report on the proposal for research and evaluation of programs funded by the Scheuer Amendment of 1966 to the Economic Opportunity Act. After considerable discussion relative to the establishment of overhead rates, it was suggested that the National Office poll its members as to their rates in order to develop some guidelines to suggest in future contract negotiations. Director Ray suggested that Director Pitchell receive the report and continue contact with those institutions which might most likely be participating in that program, and ascertain what their overhead rates might be.

The Department of Defense, at the present time, is suggesting a comprehensive research study of their total educational operation.

The board continued discussing at considerable length the comprehensive research study suggested by the Department of Defense relative to its total educational operation. Somewhat heated discussions developed, and questions were raised whether this is in fact an appropriate function for the Washington Office, whether it had such capabilities and also that it appeared to place it in direct conflict with research and study interests and competencies of some of the member institutions.

Director Ray made the motion, seconded by Director Lawshe, that the report of the Director on current negotiations with federal agencies be approved and implemented in accordance with discussions. Passed.

The executive Committee of NAPSAE was introduced to the board by Director Pitchell.

Association of College and Research Libraries Committee on Standards Guidelines for Library Service to Extension Students

1. *Library services for extension purposes should be financed on a regular basis.* It is difficult to know what is a reasonable amount, but the important thing is that funds be budgeted specifically for this purpose and that, on the basis of empirical evidence, adjustments be made as needed. An extension division may have its own separate library to which it will allocate funds, or it may provide the university library with supplementary funds to provide this service. In either case a regular budget is essential, and the responsibility for good library service must be shared jointly by the extension division and the university library.

2. *A professional librarian should be given the specific responsibility for handling library materials and services for extension classes.* This may be a full-time person (or persons) in a separate extension division library, or it may be a person in the university library who is given the assignment on a part-time or full-time basis. In any event, this person should be in close touch with the extension division staff and instructors in the field and should be kept informed of immediate and long-range plans for courses requiring library materials.

3. *Before approving the teaching of a course off campus, the appropriate officer in the extension division, the instructor, and the librarian in charge of library materials and services for extension should consider jointly what the library needs are for the course and the extent to which these can be supplied locally or through the university library.* In the case of the course which is largely a "textbook course" on campus and in which library materials are rarely used, there will be little problem. If the course is one which requires considerable library use, library resources in the community where the course is to be taught should be examined. This may require a visit by the librarian to the community, and arrangements may be made with a local public library, college, or other institution for the use of its facilities by extension students. This may involve use of space for materials and equipment to be deposited there, or it may include the granting of a substantial subsidy to the local library for the acquisition of special material needed by the extension students. It is possible that if a survey were made of course offerings at various extension centers within a state, provision could be made for the exchange of library materials through telephone or teletype communication and rapid delivery of books and journals. In some cases it may be possible for several universities offering courses in the same community to establish an extension library on a cooperative basis. Possibilities for cooperation with the state library should be explored, for this agency has a primary interest in the extension of library services. If, in the opinion of the librarian and the instructor, adequate library resources cannot be made available, the course should not be approved.

4. *Special attention should be given to the availability of library resources taught at the graduate level.* It is generally agreed that in most courses at the graduate level, particularly in the humanities, social sciences, and professional education, library resources are necessary in greater depth than in courses taught at the undergraduate level. The dean should require a statement from the librarian and the instructor indicating the extent of available library resources to support any graduate course under consideration and giving their opinion regarding their adequacy.

5. *The use of the university library should be encouraged and, where feasible, required.* If the extension classes are evening classes taught on campus, requirements and privileges ought to be the same as for regular day students. The library should be open late enough in the evening to accommodate the evening students who need library services at the close of their classes. Off-campus students should be given borrowing privileges to enable them to make full use of campus library resources, and they should be expected to travel to the home campus periodically. The instructor has the responsibility for encouraging the student to use libraries, but, more than that, if the course is one requiring special library needs, he should instruct the students in library use.

6. *Essential journal materials and indexes should be provided despite the understandable problems involved in making them available.* The fact that they are more difficult to provide in depth off campus does not justify their being neglected. Duplicate sets, articles copied within the "fair use" interpretation of the copyright law, and microform copies and the equipment to read them may be used. Arrangements with local and state libraries may be especially important for this kind of material. The typical public library is not likely to have the journal resources needed for academic work, but, with financial help from the university, it would, perhaps, be willing to acquire and make available the required materials. In courses where a research experience is vital to the student, use of the library on the home campus should be required if other research libraries are not available in the community in which the student lives.

The above "guidelines" are not meant to be used as "standards" in evaluating library services to extension students. As the term suggests, they are meant to serve only as a guide to an institution concerned about its own program. Full acceptance and implementation of suggestions will not necessarily insure a quality of library service equal to that available on campus, but it will certainly result in a significant improvement in the services now being given.

REPORTS OF THE DIVISIONS

REPORT OF THE DIVISION OF AUDIO-VISUAL COMMUNICATIONS

Gene Faris, audio-visual center, Indiana University, was elected as chairman of the division and Thurston M. Reeves, audio-visual center, Pennsylvania State University was elected co-chairman. Donald Brumbaugh, University of Utah, was elected secretary and treasurer. In addition to these three people the other people elected as executive board members were: John Long, University of Omaha; C. W. Ballew, University of Missouri, and Frederick A. White, University of Wisconsin.

During the meeting at Ann Arbor a two-day program was held. Those people present felt the materials presented were extremely valuable and pertinent to the audio-visual media phase of extension. It was the strong feeling of the group present at Ann Arbor that the audio-visual members of university extension should continue as a division of NUEA and it is sincerely hoped that the board of directors of NUEA will agree with that decision.

I will communicate to all of the institutional representatives whose names I have and inform them both of the results of the election for board and officers and alert them to the fact that the next conference for NUEA will be held in July in Miami. The July date may make it much more feasible for the institutional representatives to attend the conference. It is also possible that the Audio-Visual Division will request that it be given permission to have its annual meeting at the same time as the NEA—Department of Audio-Visual Instruction conference. This would be one method of insuring the presence of practically all of the representatives of at least one meeting of the division. I am certain a number of members of the various audio-visual parts of extension would want to attend the annual conference and we are quite united in the feeling that for future conferences we should make determined effort to give assistance and to participate in the programs of the other divisions.

F. A. WHITE
Chairman

REPORT OF THE DIVISION OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The work of the Division of Community Development during the past year can be summarized in three basic categories: (1) *Continuing Operations*, including the national community development seminar, the biennial regional leadership orientation seminar series, research, publication, annual conference program, nominations and elections, and relationships with other organizations. (2) *Assessment of Programs*, specifically,a review of the national seminar and by-laws revision. (3) *Planning Activity*, involving meetings of the executive and administrative bodies.

The effort required in these categories has been supplied by division committees. Significant details of their activities and rosters of their membership are given below.

MEETINGS OF DIVISION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

The officers of the division met at Michigan State University in October, 1966 to review developments of concern to the division.

The administrative committee met at the University of Chicago's Center For Continuing Education in February, 1967. Agenda topics included the 1967 Annual Conference program, the national community development seminar, publications, revision of by-laws, research, the NUEA-General Federation of Women's Clubs project, the development of funding for graduate scholarships and fellowships in community development, and guidelines for the continuance of relationships with other national organizations engaged in the field. NUEA Executive Director, Robert J. Pitchell, met with the committee for the purpose of participating in discussions concerning the relationship of the division to the Washington office.

SEARS ROEBUCK FOUNDATION GRANT

In January the division received word from the Sears Roebuck Foundation that its request for financial support for a planning meeting had been approved. The Sears grant made it possible for the administrative committee to meet in February in Chicago. Details of the meeting are given above.

Past involvements of the division with the Sears Roebuck Foundation have included the cross-country leadership orientation sessions conducted every two years in cooperation with the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in which division leadership works with host NUEA institutions, and the GFWC-Sears national community improvement program contest, in which judges from NUEA member institutions have played significant roles.

LEADERSHIP ORIENTATION SEMINARS: NATIONAL COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

October of 1966 saw the completion of a schedule of six two-day seminars which involved some 500 members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in leadership orientation sessions. Member institutions which served as hosts included Syracuse, Michigan State, Missouri, Oregon, Arizona, and Georgia. This was the third in the series of biennial seminars which originated in 1962. The division cooperates in this endeavor with the GFWC and the Sears Roebuck Foundation through its committee on liaison.

FIFTH NATIONAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR

Michigan State University was the scene of the fifth in the series of national community development seminars, held September 11 to 14, 1966, under the sponsorship of the Institute for Community Development and Services. Forty-one persons from twelve universities and other agencies attended.

PUBLICATIONS

Senecal, Robert, and Smith, Harry (eds.). *New Dimensions in Community Development.* Proceedings of the meetings of the division at the fifty-first annual conference. Iowa City, Iowa: Institute of Public Affairs, University of Iowa, 1966. Copies of this publication were distributed in December, 1966, to all deans and directors of member institutions, members of the board of directors, directors of community development programs, program participants, and other interested persons.

Hoiberg, Otto L. (ed.). *A Look Ahead.* A report on the February 1967 meeting of the administrative committee. Lincoln, Nebraska: University Extension Division, University of Nebraska, 1967.

Levak, Albert E., Ishino, Iwao, and Press, Charles (eds.). *Social Scientists View Poverty As A Social Problem.* Papers presented at the fifth national community development seminar, September, 1966. East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Community Development and Services, Michigan State University, 1967.

Copies of these documents will be distributed upon publication in May to deans and directors, program participants, directors of community development programs, and other interested persons.

THE ANN ARBOR MEETINGS

The Ann Arbor sessions were developed by the Annual Conference program committee. A direct contribution was made by the national community development seminar review committee which suggested that a one-day preconference seminar be conducted on a trial basis. As a result, the program committee organized a session featuring Roland Warren, professor of community theory, Brandeis University, who discussed the relationship between community development and community theory. Responding from the operational area were J. Carrol Bottum, assistant head of the Department of Agricultural Economics, Purdue University, and Hugh Denney, chairman, Department of Regional and Community Affairs, University of Missouri. Howard Y. McClusky, professor of educational psychology and consultant in community adult education, Extension Service, University of Michigan, summarized the day's deliberations.

Joseph G. Colmen, deputy assistant secretary for education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, spoke on "Students, Schools, Service and Society—A New Mix" at the second program session. Also featured were Paul Delker, director of Title I, United States Office of Education and Mack Easton, dean of extension, University of Colorado, who provided respectively, a review of Title I projects and an evaluation of the current effect of the Title on university programs of community service.

Significant actions at the business session included the acceptance of new by-laws which had been developed by the by-laws revision committee and the election of officers and members of the administrative committee. New division chairman is Otto G. Hoiberg, head, community development, Extension Division, University of Nebraska. Duane L. Gibson, director, Institute for Community Development and Services, Michigan State University and Keith Wilson, project director, Bureau of Community Development, University of Utah, were elected to the respective positions of vice chairman and secretary.

Newly elected to membership on the administrative committee are John O. Dunbar, assistant director, Cooperative Extension Service, Purdue University and Robert J. Senecal, community development specialist, Institute of Public Affairs, University of Iowa. Jack D. Mezirow, associate dean, Statewide Programs, University of California, was re-elected to the committee.

Robert Child
Chairman

REPORT OF THE DIVISION OF CONFERENCES AND INSTITUTES

The executive committee of the C. & I. Division met twice during this nine month year—October 13-14, 1966, at Wayne State University, and March

3

22 in Boston following CSLEA's leadership training workshop. Attendance at both meetings was good, the ideas creative and the attitudes of members very enthusiastic.

This year the C. & I. Division sponsored and staffed a week long workshop at the University of Georgia for newcomers to conference and institute work. Seven C. & I. directors from NUEA member institutions and the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults staffed the workshop. Twenty-seven students from nineteen universities across the country attended the program. Program evaluation is continuing. At this point a second workshop is being considered for the western part of the United States.

The Annual NUEA Pre-conference program was built around the theme "Learning in the Short-Term Setting." This four-session, two-day workshop featured the following speakers: Royce Pitkin, president, Goddard College; John D. Feldhusen, professor of education psychology, Purdue University; Wilbur Brookover, professor of education, Michigan State University; and Robert Blakely, editorial writer, *Chicago Daily News*. The speakers prepared manuscripts and there is a possibility that the manuscripts will be published by CSLEA.

The division's research committee has two subcommittees, each of which is surveying the membership for certain information relative to the role and future of the C. & I. man.

A new committtee on dissemination of information is attempting to set up an information center at Wayne State University to assist all persons engaged in C. & I. work with information about programs across the country. Such information will include name and purpose of program, costs, instructional staff, members participating, evaluation, etc.

The professional development and standards committee will continue to evaluate the Georgia workshop and will continue to plan for the further professional development of C. & I. members of NUEA.

The awards committee, completing its second year's work, presented four awards. Recipients were: Robert Hattery, Oakland University, Michigan State University, and The University of Chicago.

The nominations and elections committee reported the following results of the mail ballot: Elected to the executive committee—Wayne Bechdel, Pennsylvania State University; M. H. McMichael, University of New Mexico; and Donald Deppe, University of Maryland. Larry O. Nelson, Purdue University, became chairman of the division, and Chester Leathers, University of Georgia, became vice chairman. The C. & I. representative to the NUEA board is being elected by mail ballot.

Alfred W. Storey
Chairman

REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDENCE STUDY DIVISION

The Correspondence Study Division of NUEA is made up of administrators of some sixty correspondence study offices in colleges and universities—and it is always amazing how different these sixty operations are. One cannot —with any degree of security—speak of *the* correspondence study program; one cannot speak *for* the correspondence study program as a unit.

One fact seemed very obvious during this semi-year: Between the time Mr. Eddy suggested in Albuquerque that correspondence study *should* become independent study and the time in Ann Arbor when Mr. Walker *almost announced* that it *would* there has been considerable turmoil among the members about what *correspondence study* actually *is* and what a correspondence study administrator's position both at the home institution and in the NUEA group should be.

All of this, of course, reflects the fundamental change going on in extension operations, in communication and in the teaching field. It used to be a simple matter for one non-professional individual to direct the written communications between faculty and student. It is today impossible for only one professional to know all about communication media, learning theory (for youth *and* adults) advertising and public relations, writing and editing, counseling, statistics, financing—all the areas of action which correspondence study divisions now find themselves handling for an increased number of individuals. The obvious result seems to be that the larger operations are able to move forward into the diversified service while the smaller offices are remaining traffic centers for mail service. At this point our membership is made up primarily of small operations.

The workshop and conference at Ann Arbor afforded an opportunity for all the correspondence administrators to hear very excellent presentations on the changing educational patterns in universities and colleges and to discuss the changing requirements for individuals within these patterns. It seemed to be the general feeling among correspondence study people that the individual institutions—particularly the deans and directors—would have to make some decisions in the next months and years on the position of the separate offices. The correspondence study offices cannot make these decisions unilaterally—and therefore, until more institutional decisions are made, cannot really decide about a change in title for the division.

It should be added that there was some feeling that there is really nothing wrong with correspondence study, and that calling a correspondence study office anything else is a little ridiculous.

Publications:

As usual the *Guide* continues to be a problem. In order to sell anything you need an advertising campaign and this year we did not give the publicity to the *Guide* which it deserved. The division asked the NUEA board in Ann Arbor to appoint a committee of six (three deans, three correspondence study people) to come to some decisions about this total operation.

The statement of *Criteria and Standards* needs to be reprinted, but there is some feeling that it needs clarification at some points first. The criteria and standards committee will continue to study this document and maintain it as an instrument for the division.

The *Newsletter* has served effectively as a house organ, with no pretensions towards a journal. It was the feeling in this year that professional papers would be more effective in other journals, and should be distributed as reprints with the *Newsletter*. For effective work together a group as widely scattered as the correspondence study members need a quarterly and we hope this *Newsletter* will continue its appearance.

Awards—Recognition—Resolutions

A committee has begun work on the criteria for and selection of several correspondence study course outlines for recognition as being particularly outstanding. A general guide for entries was established and the committee is now reviewing entries for further selection. We feel this will give special recognition to our faculties, and we believe such recognition will be valuable in our faculty relations.

A committee was also appointed to recognize retiring members and others who give special service to the cause of correspondence study. It is my recommendation that we establish a Gayle B. Childs award for national service which NUEA will recognize as an association award. The awards committee has been asked to study this idea. In the meantime, we recognized the service of Mrs. Lois Badger (Colorado), Mrs. Helen Carleton (Louisiana) and Mrs. Saxe Barnes (North Carolina State) all of whom are retiring this year.

Because we are so dependent on the U.S. Postal Service, and because it has managerial problems according to the postmaster we have asked that NUEA indicate by resolution our concern that the matter receive immediate attention from Congress.

U.S. Civilian Employees

Ben Zeff of the Department of Defense has asked advice on increasing our contracts to Defense employees. He has called attention to the Employees Training Act of 1958 under which all civilian employees are urged to continue their studies. We would like to see this possibility pursued on behalf of correspondence study in other offices such as State, (Foreign Service and A.I.D.), Peace Corps, Post Office, etc., and we have asked Mr. Pitchell to look into this for us.

Increased Activity

In line with changes in the structure of NUEA I have recommended that the vice chairman of the division be named board representative and be specifically designated chairman-elect, that a secretary be elected and a treasurer so that the chairman has additional help committed to carry on the division programs with as much continuity as is possible within the shifting personnel.

While the membership of the division changes drastically and sometimes rapidly there is a central core of unity of purpose which moves this service forward. I sincerely believe that this small group of rather serious off-beat educators will maintain and increase its very special place in the Univesity extension future. While I will be glad to relax from the total assignment of chairman, I have found it an exciting challenge and I will miss very much the association with members of the board.

Elizabeth Powell
Chairman

REPORT OF THE DIVISION OF EVENING COLLEGES AND CLASS EXTENSION

The advance planning session for the annual meeting was held in Chicago on February 14 and 15 with the entire planning committee present. The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults again provided helpful consultative services through James Whipple, but, for the first time in four years, the center was not asked for financial assistance to make the preplanning session possible. Undoubtedly, a considerable share of the growth of the division and the quality of the programming can be traced to the support lent by the center in the past several years.

The April 29 session at Ann Arbor opened with a presentation by Howard McClusky (professor of adult education, University of Michigan) entitled "Adventure and the Emerging Roles of the Adult Education Leader." Thurman White, speaking for himself and his fellow reactor-panel members (Smith Higgins and Cliff Winters), summarized their reaction to the talk with the statement: "Professor McClusky, we are enchanted." Copies of the speech have been distributed to the membership through Frank Neuffer at the University of Cincinnati. CSLEA has plans to publish the McClusky talk as one of its Occasional Papers.

The second session of the division carried the title "Significant Programs—with Convertible Features," during which four important programs were described by individuals who had created the programs or had administrative responsibility for their success. While each of the four programs was unique in many ways, the speaker for each made it clear how, with some modification, the program might be suited to other locations, other situations, other needs. "The Volunteer Urban Agent Program" was described by John E. Bebout and George Tapper of Rutgers; "The Weekend University" by J. E. Burkett of the University of Oklahoma; "The Impact of the Mexican-American on Society," by George H. Daigneault, University of California Extension, Santa Barbara; and "Mid-Career Guidance for Adults" by Nancy K. Schlossberg, Wayne State University.

An audience of some 130 attended the Monday and Tuesday sessions, the largest any program of the division had drawn up to this time.

With a special certificate of recognition, the division paid tribute to Frank Neuffer for the "outstanding leadership and professional service" he has contributed to the cause of continuing adult education. The division was also particularly pleased when, at the General Session III luncheon, it was revealed that Dean Neuffer had been elected an NUEA director-at-large.

New officers of the Division are: *Chairman*: (2 years) Lowell R. Eklund, dean, Continuing Education, Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan; *Secretary-Treasurer*: (1 year) William T. Utley, dean, College of Adult Education, University of Omaha, Omaha, Nebraska.

Administrative Committee: Smith Higgins (1970), dean, Division of Regional Campuses and Division of University Extension, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana; Clifford L. Winters, Jr. (1970), dean, University College, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York; Lynn W. Eley (1968*), dean, University College, Washington University of St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri; Robert Schwarz (1969), dean and director, Purdue-Michigan City Campus, Michigan City, Indiana; Russell Hales (1969), administrator of evening classes, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah; and Ralph J. Klein (1968), assistant dean, University College, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.

Ex-officio-past chairman: (2 years), Donald Z. Woods, associate dean, General Extension Division, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Areas of concern—and perhaps the beginning of on-going studies—for the division during the coming year may be 1) collection of data on the salaries, fees, honoraria and "payments" paid to teachers of extension classes, and 2) an appraisal of future role of the junior college in extension. The procedure for undertaking these two projects will depend, of course, on whether or not the association designates them as parts of large studies which the parent association will initiate.

---

* Filling unexpired term of William T. Utley.

Donald Z. Woods
Chairman

COMMITTEE AND SECTION REPORTS

REPORT OF THE SECTION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND FISCAL AFFAIRS

The section on Administrative and Fiscal Affairs held two meetings at the 1967 NUEA conference in the Michigan Union building. The first meeting was a forum on the topic "Program Budgeting Considerations for Extension." Resource persons for the program were James E. Lesch, assistant to the vice-president for academic affairs, and James I. Doi, professor of higher education, both at The University of Michigan and both leaders in the emerging concept of program budgeting in educational instiutions.

This session was attended by approximately 45 persons who represented a cross section of responsibilities in the Extension field. Mr. Lesch and Professor Doi did an excellent job of giving perspective to the topic and in reacting to questions which provided a very productive program. Many complimentary comments were received on the value of the topic and the discussion.

The second meeting of the section was confined to a business meeting with election of officers and committee members and a discussion of future plans.

Following are the officers and committee members for 1967-68: *Terms expiring 1968*: Helmut Sieg, University of Maryland, Eastern; Thomas Bergeron, Louisiana State University, Central; and Steve Oh, University of Washington, Western. *Terms expiring 1969*: Vice-chairman and chairman-elect, Edward S. Indrikson, Rutgers University, Eastern; James Thatcher, Purdue University, Central; and William Grelle, University of Colorado, Western. *Terms expiring 1970*: Grove A. Spearly, Jr., Pennsylvania State University, Eastern; Secretary, Virginia Kaloupek, University of North Dakota, Central; and Chairman, Warren Schoonover, University of California, Los Angeles, Western.

The committee drafted a resolution which was presented to the NUEA Committee on Resolutions and adopted in its report to the NUEA board of directors. The resolution requested an allocation of funds to be used at the direction of the steering committee of this section to provide suitable programs to be presented at the annual meeting of NUEA. This resolution was approved by the NUEA board of directors at its annual business meeting.

It is the sense of the steering committee that the section concept has been very good for our group and we expect to use it to advantage in the future.

John A. Wilkins,
Chairman

REPORT OF THE SECTION FOR THE ADMINISTRATORS OF CENTERS OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

President Charles F. Milner appointed the following representatives of member institutions to serve as a steering committee to develop and establish a section for administrators concerned with the operations of centers of continuing education: chairman—Richard H. Stottler, University of Maryland; board liaison, C. H. Lawshe, Purdue University; W. R. Alexander, University of Georgia; James S. Beadle, University of Notre Dame; Robert J. Emerson, Michigan State University; Floyd Fischer, Pennsylvania State University; Allen F. Krause, University of Nebraska; and Lee L. Smith, Syracuse University.

The steering committee placed considerable emphasis on the necessity for establishing an open forum for the professional exchange of information regarding the organization and operation of centers of continuing education. In addition, during the first year, its performance was concerned with the following purposes:

(1) The development of a program for the first annual meeting of the section which would be devoted to the orientation of representatives from the member institutions, and the establishment of organizational guidelines to be used during the development of the section.

(2) The preparation of a constitution and set of by-laws that could be used to govern the section within the general framework of the National University Extension Association organization.

(3) The development of lines of communication between member institutions operating centers of continuing education, representatives of member institutions concerned with the planning or building of centers, and/or representatives of member institutions having an interest in the organization and operation of centers.

(4) A major concern of the steering committee in the development of this new section of NUEA is to establish a broadly based organization within the parent association (NUEA) that will meet the professional needs of a rapidly growing segment of NUEA. The primary objective of the committee is to support continuing education programming at the various member institutions for the best professional interest of the particular institution, and to maintain the economic integrity of the center's operation through sound business practices, good communication procedures, and high professional standards among the total team of adult educators and administrators at all levels of the particular organization.

The section meetings on April 24 and 25, 1967 were well attended and the general reaction to the establishment of the section was most gratifying. There was some spirited discussion regarding the pros and cons of the basic organization of the section, but the consensus expressed resulted in an endorsement of the efforts made by the steering committee to organize a section for the administrators of centers of continuing education.

Robert F. Ernstein, assistant director, Center of Adult Education, University of Maryland, presented a prepared paper on "Why Organize A Section For Center Administrators?" The following is a brief review of this paper.

> Nearly all residential centers are constructed with the idea that they will be self-sufficient. This presents concerns regarding sources of income, qualifications of personnel, communications between conferences and institutes divisions and center staffs,

and pricing structures. Because of operating within the guidelines of an institution, yet dealing with problems similar to that of the commercial hotel, center administrators need a section within NUEA to exchange ideas on a professional level, rather than find hotel and restaurant trade shows the ONLY avenue for self-development.

W. R. Alexander, associate director, Georgia Center for Continuing Education, conducted a session on "Let's Get Acquainted With Center Operations." This portion of the program was devoted to an exchange of information on several types of center administrative organizations and operational procedures. Mr. Alexander presented an in-depth study of the Georgia center administrative and operations procedures which served as a general framework for the discussions of the afternoon. Many questions were raised and variations of organization and procedures were explained by those present.

The constitution and by-laws, as presented, were reviewed and revised by representatives of member institutions and the steering committee. The complete copy will be mailed to member institutions during the 1967-68 NUEA year for adoption by a vote of the members.

During the Tuesday session, Robert Emerson, manager, Kellogg Center for Continuing Education, Michigan State University, served as chairman of "A Panel On Administrative Problems of Operating a Center." Among the problems discussed by the panel and from the floor were the following: Unionization of center personnel, staffing center operations, utilization of facilities, need for improved communication between administrators and educators, the refinement of operating policies affecting educational programs, and rising cost and pricing.

A brief discussion of plans for the coming year included the idea of developing regional meetings to deal with operating problems of centers. The idea expressed was to have such meetings during slow operating periods at various centers. The regional meeting would offer an opportunity for greater involvement of a cross section of administrative personnel in the operating areas of centers such as directors or managers, front office or assistant managers, food service managers or executive chefs, physical plant supervisors, executive housekeepers, and finance department supervisors.

In addition, the steering committee would function throughout the year to continue the work of the section, arrange for the annual meeting in 1968, and elect new committee members within the framework of the constitution and by-laws of the section.

Richard H. Stottler
Chairman

REPORT OF THE SECTION ON ARTS AND HUMANITIES

The Arts and Humanities Section met twice at Ann Arbor, April 24 and April 25.

The primary business of the section was to choose the recipients of the section's first annual awards for creative programming, and, learning from this experience, work out the guidelines for continuing this selection process for the next year. Pursuant to this point the section awarded creative programming certificates to nine institutions: Letters and Science Extension, University of California, Berkeley; Saint Louis University, Metropolitan College, St. Louis; The Humanistic Studies Center, University College, Syracuse, New York; Division of Continuing Education, Oregon State System of Higher Education, Corvallis; Division of Continuing Education, The University of Connecticut, Storrs; General Extension Division, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; Department of Continuing Education, University of Washington, Seattle; College of General Studies, University of Hawaii, Honolulu; and University Center for Adult Education, Detroit, Michigan.

The selection committee consisted of C. R. Hager, Norbert Stirzaker, Bruce Alderman, Carl Yoke, Mike Church, Stanley Gabor, Robert Norris, Enrico Giordano, Charles Follo, Gene Harding, Martha Luck, Jerry Hargis, and Michael Williamson.

The section elected Stanley C. Gabor, assistant dean, School of Continuing Education and Extension Services, New York University, as vice-chairman of the section for 1967-68. I will continue on as chairman through the Miami conference.

The following new business was conducted at Ann Arbor:

(1) A motion that was carried by the section: "That the title and the concept of the Arts and Humanities Section be enlarged to read 'Liberal Studies Section,' with special subcategories of Art, Humanities, and Social Sciences."

(2) That the section receive some funds from the national organization to cover some of the expenses of mailing, production of certificates, travel, etc.

(3) That the chairman draft a new letter and form for the selection committee; that the creative programming awards be continued, but narrowed to particular programs of series; that area chairman be identified and that the selection of entries be carried out, for the most part, before the next conference; that a final screening of the entries be conducted on the Saturday before the opening of the conference; that the next entries should be solicited from programs that were conducted in summer (1967), fall (1967), and spring (1968), with the cut-off date of May (1968); that the announcing of the awards and their presentation be conducted before the assembled convention.

(4) With judging out of the way early enough next year, that a special program be conducted at the Miami sectional meeting. A panel reflecting various interests and problems in presenting liberal arts programs was thought to be the most interesting.

(5) That the section have some voice in the planning of the 1968 programming.

(6) That the section go on record as deploring the decision of the federal government to institute new and untried state councils for the arts when the machinery for this undertaking already exists in the present structure and scope of the university continuing education and extension divisions.

(7) That the section maintain close ties with James Whipple and CSLEA.

Robert M. Erickson
Chairman

REPORT OF THE AWARDS AND HONORS COMMITTEE

Members present at the meeting Monday, April 24, at the Michigan Union were: Harold G. Clark, chairman; Joe Goddard, representing James Arnold, Tennessee; Samuel Madden, Virginia State; Ben G. Gustafson, University of

North Dakota; and Everett Soop, University of Michigan, ex-official member.

The following business was transacted:

(1) The divisions of NUEA were commended for the practice of awarding honors which upgrade the work of their respective divisions.

(2) The committee recommends that the membership and the board and its divisions as well as the Awards and Honors Committee investigate and discover candidates for the Julius M. Nolte Award in 1968 in the following areas: (a) Men and women who may have retired from NUEA, (b) candidates from the military service, (c) Men who manage foundations funds serving adult education, (d) Men who have written significant books in the field of continuing education, (e) College and university presidents giving unusual support to continuing education, (f) Those making significant contributions to the re-education of women, and (g) Candidates in the government service.

(3) Consideration should be given to a special award for institutions rendering extraordinary service to continuing education. This would be distinct from the Julius M. Nolte Award and could be named in honor of some important person whom the association wished to honor.

(4) Appreciation is expressed to Everett Soop, Norris Hiett, Mack Easton, and Don McNeil for special services rendered the Awards and Honors Committee.

Harold G. Clark
Chairman

Statement Honoring Dean James R. D. Eddy on Presentation of Lifetime NUEA Membership

We in university extension who have been privileged to enjoy the wise counsel and companionship of James R. D. Eddy, dean, Division of Extension, The University of Texas at Austin, know him as a loyal friend, a devoted and able extension leader, and an outstanding contributor to the development of the National University Extension Association. He is a recognized, national authority in the field of vocational education and is known and respected in the business and industrial community as well as at all levels of public education.

Jim Eddy was born in Decatur, Illinois, and graduated from the University of Illinois with a major in physics in 1931. Shortly thereafter, he moved to Texas where he secured a master of science degree in industrial engineering at Texas A & M College. In 1937 he became state director of vocational education in Texas and executive officer of the Texas State Board for Vocational Education. At the invitation of The University of Texas, he resigned this position in 1944 to become director of the Industrial and Business Training Bureau in the Division of Extension. In 1951, he became dean of the Division of Extension, a position he will hold until his retirement on August 31 of this year.

During his years in university extension, Dean Eddy has been extremely active in the affairs of NUEA. From 1955-59 he served as a member of the board of directors, and served as president during the year 1959-60. He has served on many NUEA committees, and is currently chairman of the Committee on Directions, Constitutions, and Fees, as well as chairman of the

Vestibule Committee, which he established in 1960. He also established the Honors Committee and served as its first chairman.

In addition to serving as chairman of important state committees in Texas, he is a former president of the National Association of Industrial Educators, the Texas Vocational Association, and a former editor of the *American Vocational Journal for Industrial Education.*

Dean and Mrs. Eddy now reside in a fine home on a bluff overlooking Lake Travis near Austin where they will enjoy his years of retirement, including travel, writing, and professional activities of his choice. While the presence of Dean Eddy among us will be missed, the influence of his achievements will be here for years to come. We wish him well in his new life.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DISCUSSION AND DEBATE

During the period of this report the national office of the Committee on Discussion and Debate continued its work from the University of Oregon campus. The associate director, Robert P. Friedman, added to the staff in September, 1965, accepted permanent appointment to the national office. When the director was granted a leave of absence without pay for the 1966-67 academic year, Mr. Friedman was appointed as acting director of the national office.

During the period of this report the Fortieth Volume of *The Forensic Quarterly* was published with issues in the months of April, May, August, and November, devoted to the problems of foreign aid policy. As in recent years, a Library Edition containing all four issues of *The Forensic Quarterly* was made available in November. THE BULLETIN, a monthly news letter, continued to provide communication among the national office, member and affiliate offices, friends of the committee, publishers, and interested organizations.

The committee, through the national office, continued to seek free and low cost materials on the national topic to supplement the articles prepared for publication in *The Forensic Quarterly*. These efforts were immeasurably aided by cooperation from government agencies, interested organizations, educators, private foundations, publishers, and authors. The committee believes its main task and purpose is to make responsible and varied information and opinion on the problem area available to students engaged in discussion and debate in high schools throughout the nation.

In support of this task, the following financial report reflects the fiscal activity of the national office during the period of this report.

The National Office
Committee on Discussion and Debate
National University Extension Association

Financial Report: December 1, 1965—November 30, 1966:

Balance on hand December 1, 1965		$26,497.67
Interest paid to Savings Accounts from 12-1-65—11-30-66		25.86
		$26,523.53
RECEIPTS:		
Forensic Quarterly, Back issues	$ 5,916.77	
Forensic Quarterly, 1966-67	34,112.43	$40,029.20
Forensic Library, 1965	3,484.07	

Forensic Library, 1966	5,627.30	9,111.37
Gifts		25,072.35
Interest		1,129.69
Miscellaneous		1,266.41
Transfer of Funds from 9302 to 9301		1,000.00
		$77,609.02
		$104,132.55

DISBURSEMENTS:

Printing	$15,518.10
Salaries and Wages	20,873.17
Postage, Petty Cash and Mailing	1,646.56
Office Expenses	1,715.99
Travel-Hotel	1,216.39
Convention Expenses	671.77
Honoraria	51.50
Gifts	24,572.35
Forensic Library (Publishers)	7,724.49
Miscellaneous	3,521.26
Transfer of Funds from 9302 to 9301	1,000.00
	$78,511.58
Balance on hand November 30, 1966	$25,620.97

D. MACK EASTON
Chairman

REPORT OF THE SECTION ON EXTENSION SERVICES FOR THE ARMED FORCES

The Section on Extension Services for the Armed Forces had two successful sessions. Each session was devoted to a discussion of problems currently facing the military and the universities. As in the past, emphasis was given to the need for special program arrangements.

A second topic which was discussed at some length was the problem career military men face in preparing for and finding civilian job opportunities. It was suggested that universities give consideration to planning programs to assist the military retiree in establishing a second career.

An attempt was made to assess the impact of higher levels of education attained by many military personnel on university programs, in light of the exigencies of the world situation.

O. W. SNARR
Chairman

REPORT OF THE FINANCIAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

During the year the Financial Affairs Committee worked with the executive director in further refining the unified accounting system developed and reported last year. Other specific accomplishments included the following:

(1) NUEA financial records have been re-arranged to conform with ACE accounting practices.

(2) Quarterly financial statements are now being issued and budget condition reports are being submitted to the board quarterly by the executive director.

(3) A system of advanced budgeting for the divisions has been developed and will be inaugurated during this next year in order to be operational for the following year.

(4) The board extended to the Executive Committee authority to manage the investments of the association.

(5) The by-laws were amended so as to separate the offices of secretary and treasurer. In the future, the treasurer will be chairman of the committee on financial affairs.

C. H. LAWSHE
Chairman

REPORT OF THE GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE

A major effort was concentrated on the appropriation for Title I during the fall of 1967 after the Senate Appropriations Committee eliminated the $10,000,000 appropriation passed by the House. Members of the Governmental Relations Committee, deans and directors and friends in every part of the country made known to senators and representatives the adverse effects of the loss of this program. The appropriation was restored in conference committee.

The committee, which has been expanded to 40 members, met twice at the annual meeting in Ann Arbor and set priorities for the current year.

HOWARD WALKER
Chairman

REPORT OF THE INTER-ASSOCIATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE

The Inter-Associational Relations Committee makes the following recommendations:

(1) The NUEA should take the lead in reestablishing a joint committee of NUEA, AUEC, and AFSTE to promote dialogue between the associations and to identify common interests.

(2) The newly created *ad hoc* committee is handling relations with related professional adult education associations. The board is making plans to relate to the professional associations, such as AMA. Hence this committee feels that its most useful role is to develop relationships with other associations that have some interests in common with NUEA. Priority will be given to associations to which NUEA pays dues, such as the American Alumni Council.

(3) If such a focus is satisfactory the committee will develop a list of organizations in order of priority and ask the office of the president to make the initial contact. The committee will follow through with developing continuing relationships.

C. B. RATCHFORD
Chairman

REPORT OF THE JOINT AUEC-NUEA COMMITTEE ON MINIMUM DATA AND DEFINITIONS

During the year, the Joint Committee activities included the following:

(1) The committee published its regular annual report on programs and registrations for the period ending June 30, 1966. Registrations totaled 5,077,776, which included 4,926,067 registrations in 182,249 programs (classes,

conferences, discussion groups) and 151,709 correspondence registrations.

(2) In view of the wide interest that developed in the committee's three-year summary of program and registration data with its attendant projection of future trends (published after the end of the 1962-63 year), the committee is currently undertaking a six-year summary through the year 1965-66, which will cover all data collected and reported since the inception of the project. The greater body of material now available, together with the improvement in efficiency of reporting methods, should strengthen the validity of projections.

(3) The committee continues its liaison relationship with the U.S. Office of Education's National Center for Educational Statistics, serving in a consulting capacity in this agency's development of a national survey on higher adult education. The latest previous USOE survey of this nature was conducted in 1957; the projected, urgently needed, new survey is scheduled for completion during 1967. In connection with this project, the chairman of the Joint Committee recently met in Washington with the staff of the National Center for Educational Statistics; in addition, all committee members conferred with representatives of this agency during the March, 1967, CSLEA Conference in Boston, and again during the April, 1967, NUEA Annual Conference at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor.

(4) The committee continues to work with the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers in the preparation of a revised *Handbook of Data and Definitions in Higher Education* with the committee's specific assignment that of development and/or clarification of terminology related to higher adult education. The revised handbook will be published by the U.S. Office of Education, with publication date scheduled for 1967.

FRANK NEUFFER
University of Cincinnati
Representing AUEC

HOWELL MCGEE
University of Oklahoma
Representing AUEC

GAYLE CHILDS
University of Nebraska
Representing NUEA

PHILLIP E. FRANDSON, *Chairman*
University of California Extension
Los Angeles
Representing NUEA

REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE AND FEE MODIFICATION

Attention and efforts were devoted to:

(1) Reviewing the association's charter and bylaws relative to need for changes.

(2) Incorporating new sections and administrative committees (their respective objectives, internal organization, and working procedures) into the official Handbook, which was prepared by the committee and accepted by the association last year.

(3) Reviewing the institutional membership dues for 1967.

(4) Preparation of a plan through which a new type of membership—affiliate members—could be established within the association.

Major features of Item 4 above are (a) Qualifications for membership. (b) Procedures for application. (c) Rights and privileges. (d) Membership dues.

More detailed provisions of this item are contained in the minutes of the board of directors meeting April 25. A copy of the complete plan can be obtained from the office of the executive secretary, Washington, D.C.

During the association's business meeting, the committee recommended that in recognition of 1) the association's current financial status, 2) its anticipated income and expenditures for fiscal 1968, and 3) the fact that its current dues structure has been effective only one year, there should be no change in institutional membership dues during the ensuing year.

STANLEY C. ROBINSON
Chairman

REPORT OF THE SECTION ON PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF UNIVERSITY ADULT EDUCATION

On April 24, the section drafted a report composed of a statement of purpose, a recommendation for its implementation and a suggested structure which were presented to the NUEA board of directors by Dean Harold Montross. The section was advised to proceed with the actions outlined in the report with the option of having the election of the executive officers in the section meeting on April 25 or to request the board of directors to appoint the officers.

At the section meeting, April 25, it was decided to proceed with the nomination and election by acclamation of the following: Chairman—William Dowling, University of Wisconsin Extension; Vice-Chairman—W. R. Brown, University of Georgia; and Secretary—Kay Eyde, Michigan State University. Chairman Montross then handed over the meeting to Chairman Dowling who conferred with the organizing participants on procedures designed to carry out actions proposed in the report.

It was the consensus of those present that the chairman should proceed with invitations to the committees of the five NUEA divisions and the Commission of the Professors of Adult Education to appoint three official representatives each to the Section on Professional Development of University Adult Education and to submit these to the NUEA board of directors for confirmation; at the same time the chairman will request the board to appoint an additional three committee members from NUEA membership who would not be represented by the official division representatives.

The Chairman appointed a research committee, consisting of: Peter Siegle, Ralph Dobbs, Jindra Kulich, Tunis Dekker, Martin Chamberlain, William Daw, Kay Eyde, and Wayne Shute.

With regard to the proposed research, the chairman was given a free hand to proceed to develop the research proposal which is to be submitted to the board within thirty days. The chairman is free to consult with any other persons in carrying out this task.

The chairman was also asked to approach the board for funds necessary to carry out the research project. These funds were to include subsidy for a meeting of the research committee which is to meet for a briefing on the proposal and the actions of the board, as well as to discuss and outline further research projects.

It was suggested that doctoral dissertations by George Aker and Martin Chamberlain as well as other pertinent studies be reviewed and utilized in the work of the committee.

It was brought to the attention of the chairman that the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities has established a committee of its own charged with tasks similar to those of the NUEA Section on the Professional Development of University Adult Education and that cooperation and coordination of effort between these two groups should be seriously considered.

The group wishes to express its appreciation to Dean Harold Montross for the leadership he gave to the section during the past months and during the formative stages of the resulting committee with its respective role.

A Report and Recommendation for the Strengthening of the Professional Development Section in NUEA

The following purposes were cited:

(1) Identify the profession of continuing education in the context of NUEA.

(A) Professional training, prior to employment of continuing education personnel to include recruitment of professional personnel.

(B) In-service training of continuing education personnel.

(2) Identification, evaluation and dissemination of information about existing opportunities for professional pre-employment and in-service training of continuing educational personnel. For example, provision of leadership for solving community development problems.

(3) Identify voids in professional training for continuing education personnel and stimulate institutions of higher education to develop programs to fill these voids.

(4) Assist the professors of adult education to relate the theory to the practical problems and responsibilities of continuing education work.

(5) This section should serve as a consultative and coordinative body to divisions and sections of NUEA in their professional development training programs.

RECOMMENDATION:

To begin implementation of the foregoing purposes we recommend that the board set aside necessary funds to facilitate a research proposal to be submitted by the section to them within thirty days.

The following structure was recommended:

(1) The appointment of a section chairman, vice chairman, and secretary.

(2) The appointment of the three official representatives to the section from each division who will serve three year staggered terms, with the exception of those appointed initially for 1967-70 of the initial three appointment from each division, one will have a one-year term, one a two year term and only the third will have a three year term.

(3) The chairman of the section will have the responsibility to appoint as official representatives three persons with generalist skills (such as staff development or program development specialists, who are not division members) from NUEA institutions and three members of the Commission of Professors of Adult Education.

W. D. DOWLING
Chairman

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS AND PUBLIC INFORMATION

The committee commended the *Spectator* and *Proceedings* staff for the fine work being done and for the improvements which the past year has brought, and also expressed its appreciation for the excellent coverage of the Annual Meeting.

Looking ahead to the Galaxy meeting of 1969, for which plans will be made well in advance, the committee expresses the hope that whatever publicity organization may be created will include members of our staffs who understand the professional approach to the news media so that the story of this great assemblage of continuing educators and their work may be properly told.

NICHOLAS P. MITCHELL
Chairman

REPORT OF THE RESEARCH SECTION

The meeting was called to order by William Griffith, acting chairman, in the absence of John L. Davies who had been suddenly called to California because of an illness in his family.

In the first session those who attended identified several areas of possible emphasis for the work of the members of the section for the coming year. It was agreed that the President of NUEA would be requested to appoint to the committee only those persons who were willing to assume a continuing responsibility for sectional activity. Accordingly the group recommends that the persons whose names are on the accompanying roster be named to the Research Section for 1967-68 and that any other members added be individuals who have made a commitment to serve.

The major activity of the Monday session was the identification of areas of responsibility for the section membership. On Tuesday the time was devoted to a clarification of the areas of responsibility and the voluntary agreement of various members to serve on particular committees. These committees and the names of the persons who volunteered are as follows.

Committee 1

Functions: (1) To establish a communication network among those engaged in "NUEA—relevant" research at member institutions.

(2) To establish a roster of individuals employed to conduct research in the extension divisions of member institutions.

Members: Henry A. Bern and Robert Wilson.

Committee 2

Functions: (1) To plan the first session of the 1968 section meeting at the NUEA Conference.

(2) To explore the possibility of having a speaker on research at one of the 1968 NUEA general sessions.

Members: Betty Giuliani, Clara Kanun, and Mrs. Margaret B. Nevin.

Committee 3

Functions: (1) To encourage the publishing of short articles on research in the *Spectator* by inviting specific researchers to prepare such articles.

(2) To check such articles to insure their excellence and their relevance to the readers of the *Spectator* before transmitting them to the editor.

Members: James A. Duncan and Lynn Davie.

Committee 4

Functions: (1) To review the data gathering and dissemination practices of the Washington office of the association.

(2) To survey the extent of data collection practiced by NUEA member institutions.

Members: H. LeRoy Marlow, William S. Griffith, Hugo Stein, and Philip E. Frandson.

Committee 5

Functions: (1) To devise a system for recognizing the outstanding piece of NUEA relevant adult education research for 1967.

(2) To devise a system for recognizing the extension dean who has made the greatest institutional contribution to research in 1967.

Members: Entire section.

Those attending the meeting expressed their regret at the lack of liaison with the board and hoped that a functioning communication channel would be developed by the incoming NUEA president.

A majority of those present agreed to meet for one day either prior to or following the February meeting of the National Seminar on Adult Education Research to be held at The University of Chicago, to discuss the progress of the committees and plans for the annual meeting.

The section meeting was adjourned with a conviction that the members were ready to embark on a year of significant activity.

WILLIAM S. GRIFFITH
Acting Chairman

REPORT OF THE SECTION ON TEACHER EDUCATION

The section recommends the continuation for a year of the present committee: Norman A. Braden, Smith Higgins, J. D. Marcus, and David J. Middleton, with Gordon C. Godbey as chairman.

This committee intends to appoint an advisory group of professional educators for consultative purposes. A maximum of eleven persons is anticipated. In addition, advice will be sought from non-NUEA members on an ad hoc basis.

The section voted to retain its current name for the next year, but to review the matter at the 1968 meeting.

The section does not have the manpower to establish a clearinghouse of information on legislation affecting education, but believes that other agencies are doing this task in a satisfactory manner.

The section will be available to advise with the NUEA president and board on legislation affecting teacher education.

The section urges the study by the committee of the question of a nation-wide examination of the need and resources for continued education for teachers and school related professionals, para-professionals and technicians. The committee will recommend any action it believes is needed after further exploration. Establishment of the status quo, of extrapolations for future action, of possible agencies to conduct needed research, and of statements of goals are contemplated.

The committee will examine the broad area of early childhood education so far as the role of university extension is concerned. If action is deemed appropriate, it will be recommended to the president.

Possible relationships with the national network of regional educational laboratories will be investigated and a report made to the president.

The committee will consider with its advisory group a plan described by Dean R. F. W. Smith of NYU to prepare in a two-year program through (largely) extension a sub-professional assistant teacher.

The section committee requests a small budget for secretarial help and communication expense to be handled by the chairman.

G. C. GODBEY
Chairman

REPORT OF THE WORLD AFFAIRS SECTION

The Section on World Affairs met on Monday, April 24, 1967, in conjunction with the NUEA Annual Conference at Ann Arbor, Michigan. Also present at the meeting was a representative of the United States Department of State.

Agenda included an exchange of information and ideas on programs in the field of world affairs now current in colleges and universities in the United States. Particular attention was paid to programs conducted by noted visitors from foreign countries.

The section drafted a resolution, later adopted by the full membership of NUEA, commending the Congress of the United States for including the International Education Act provisions for adult citizen education in world affairs, and encouraging appropriate funding for this purpose. The section urged that the U.S. Office of Education develop guidelines for implementation of those portions of the act which relate to education for adult citizens in the field of world affairs.

Pursuant to this resolution, the chairman of the World Affairs Section attended a meeting in Washington, D.C. on April 28 convened by Paul Miller of the U.S. Office of Education. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the prospects for federal assistance to programs of continuing education in world affairs, with particular reference to the International Education Act. Also in attendance was William C. Rogers, director of the Minnesota World Affairs Center and a member of the NUEA World Affairs Section, two other university extension representatives, and representatives of several other public and private agencies concerned with citizen world affairs education.

As a result of this meeting, Mr. Miller agreed to commission the preparation of a position paper on world affairs continuing education to help the Office of Education prepare its policies and criteria for the administration of programs under the International Education Act. While funds have not yet been appropriated under the act, and the terms of the legislation appear to relate at this stage primarily to undergraduate and graduate education, the possibilities of federal support for some kinds of university extension world affairs programs have at least been opened up. Moreover, a clear interest in such programs is now evident in the Office of Education, and a number of developments, not limited to the International Education Act, may emerge out of this interest.

LEONARD FREEDMAN
Chairman

STATEMENT NO. 1

National University Extension Association

BALANCE SHEET

March 31, 1967

ASSETS

General Fund:		
Cash		$ 5,257.93
Investment in savings certificates		50,000.00
Accounts receivable (net)		6,034.11
Inventories of publications		6,183.75
Deposits and advances		570.00
Prepaid expenses		301.45
Deferred expenses		1,292.58
Due from Restricted Funds		21,089.62
Total General Funds		90,729.44
Restricted Funds:		
Research and service projects:		
Accounts receivable		10.00
Grant balances receivable		156,000.00
Total Restricted Funds		156,010.00
Plant Fund:		
Due from General Fund		3,156.58
Furniture, fixtures and equipment, at cost	$6,565.85	
Less: Accumulated depreciation	656.58	5,909.27
Total Plant Fund		9,065.85
Total		$255,805.29

LIABILITIES

General Fund:	
Accounts payable	$ 14,056.13
Liability for unremitted payroll taxes	4,329.04
Due to Plant Fund	3,156.58
Fund balance	69,187.69
Total General Fund	90,729.44
Restricted Funds:	
Research and service projects:	
Cash overdraft	8,029.39
Accounts payable	66,085.95
Due to General Fund	21,089.62
Fund balance	60,805.04
Total Restricted Funds	156,010.00
Plant Fund:	
Fund balance	9,065.85
Total Plant Fund	9,065.85
Total	$255,805.29

STATEMENT NO. 2

National University Extension Association

SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN GENERAL FUND BALANCE

Year Ended March 31, 1967

Balance, April 1, 1966		$52,313.74
Additions:		
Excess of income over expenses (Statement No. 4)		25,939.80
		78,253.54
Deductions:		
Transfers to Plant Fund:		
Furniture, fixtures and equipment acquired during year	6,565.85	
Appropriation to furnish conference room	2,500.00	
		9,065.85
Balance, March 31, 1967		$69,187.69

STATEMENT NO. 3

National University Extension Association

SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN PLANT FUND BALANCE

Year Ended March 31, 1967

Transfers from General Fund during year:	
Furniture, fixtures and equipment acquired during the fiscal year	$6,565.85
Appropriation to furnish conference room	2,500.00
Balance, March 31, 1967	$9,065.85

STATEMENT NO. 4

National University Extension Association

STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENSES

Year Ended March 31, 1967

Income:	
Membership dues	$52,400.00
Sales of publications	1,344.20
Visitation fees	2,400.00
Income from investments	2,171.55
Administrative service charges—Research and service projects	17,347.62
Total income	75,663.37

Expenses:		
Washington office:		
Salaries	$34,201.11	
Payroll taxes and employee benefits	4,710.42	
Consultant fees	1,070.00	
Travel and related expenses	3,171.16	
Rent	3,292.35	
Telephone and telegraph	1,737.57	
Office supplies and expense	1,491.55	
Postage	785.93	
Printing and duplicating	1,468.47	
Depreciation	656.58	
Legal and audit fees	1,808.22	
Insurance	105.61	
Educational and research materials	203.82	
Other	243.25	
Total Washington office	54,946.04	
Less: Expenses charged to projects:		
Salaries	17,365.20	
Payroll taxes and employee benefits	2,420.38	
Rent	1,337.50	
Depreciation	407.65	
Total expenses charged to projects	21,530.73	
Net Washington office expense		33,415.31
Board of Directors' expenses		1,162.77
Annual meeting		546.98
Divisions:		
Correspondence Study		10.41
Conferences and Institutes (net of CSLEA grant)		837.25
Community Development		159.22
Minneapolis office		1,351.56
Dues to other associations		330.00
Visitation expense		818.53
Publication expenses		9,018.16
Washington office start-up cost		923.38
Washington representative		150.00
University of Wisconsin film study		1,000.00
Total net expenses		49,723.57
Excess of income over expenses		$25,939.80

STATEMENT NO. 5

National University Extension Association

STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENSES AND FUND BALANCES
RESEARCH AND SERVICE PROJECT FUNDS

Year Ended March 31, 1967

	Adult Basic Education Program		FDA Drug Industry Survey	Sears Roebuck Grant	ACE Grant	Total
	1966	1967				
Income						
Grants	$1,055,000.00	$50,000.00#	$500.00	$2,000.00	$5,270.19	$1,112,770.19
Expenses:						
Salaries	75,279.92	3,155.82			4,100.85	82,536.59
Payroll taxes and employee benefits	7,579.18	631.80			361.87	8,572.65
Consultant fees	28,137.25	1,624.50				29,761.75
Travel and related expenses	17,509.59	953.88		1,131.51	318.61	19,913.59
Rent	7,200.02				90.00	7,290.02
Telephone and telegraph	8,085.80	440.54	260.27	25.90	246.91	9,059.42
Office supplies and expense	5,904.39	37.00	22.11		22.60	5,986.10
Postage	1,945.33		31.41		13.55	1,990.29
Printing and duplicating	8,472.70	74.92	17.52		90.45	8,655.59
Equipment usage	3,887.75	30.00				3,917.75
Legal fees	810.76					810.76
Administrative service charge	15,857.49	1,390.13		100.00		17,347.62
Miscellaneous expenses	1,497.32	20.16	3.00		25.55	1,546.03
Expenses to institutions:						
Stipends, travel, etc.	488,260.35					488,260.35
Instructional costs	324,000.00					324,000.00
General conference expenses:						
Honorarium fees	4,437.50	450.00				4,887.50
Travel and related expenses	25,523.77	9,816.92				35,340.69
Miscellaneous expenses	1,947.33	141.12				2,088.45
Total expenses	1,026,336.45	18,766.79	334.31	1,257.41	5,270.19	1,051,965.15
Excess of income over expenses—Fund balances, March 31, 1967	$ 28,663.55	$31,233.21	$165.69	$ 742.59	$ -0-	$ 60,805.04

Supplemental grant pending amendment extending program to June 30, 1968.